amendment, debate will resume on the Mondale amendment as amended, if amended, and under a time limitation of 20 minutes. A yea-and-nay vote will occur then on the Mondale amendment about 11:30 a.m.

Upon the disposition of the Mondale amendment, the Senate will take up the amendment by Mr. HELMS, under a 20-minute time limitation. A yea-and-nay vote will occur on the Helms amendment at 12:05 p.m.

Upon the disposition of the Helms amendment, the Senate will take up the motion by Mr. HRUSKA to recommit the bill, under a time limitation of 90 minutes. If the full 90 minutes are taken, the vote on the motion to recommit the bill will occur about 1:50 p.m.

Upon the disposition of the Hruska motion to recommit, if the recommittal motion fails, the Senate will debate the bill for the remaining time, approximately 55 minutes, until final passage of the bill on a rollcall vote at 3 p.m.

Upon the disposition of the no-fault insurance bill, action will be resumed on the wage and price controls amendment. It is anticipated that yea and nay votes will occur on a division of the amendment, and possibly on other amendments, and hopefully action can be completed on the bill tomorrow. If not, final action will hopefully occur on Thursday.

The Senate will operate on a double track beginning tomorrow and proceeding daily thereafter.

On Thursday, the main track item, in all likelihood, would be the education bill, S. 1539.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Where would S. 2986 come in, in the event it were not disposed of tomorrow night?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. On Thursday.

Mr. TOWER. It would come in the second track on Thursday?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. It would be one of the track items, with the main track item being the education bill.

I think it would be the intention of the leadership, if at all possible, to finish the wage and price control amendments tomorrow, and hopefully the bill. If not, it would be desired that the action on the bill would then be completed on Thursday.

Possible second track items on Thursday, Friday, and into next week would be the following, but not necessarily in the order listed:

The supplemental appropriation bill which was reported today by the Committee on Appropriations;

S. 3203, the NLR extension to hospital employees;

S. 3331, Small Business Administration;

S. 411, Postal Service;

H.R. 11385, health services;

S. 3267, the energy bill;

H.R. 8217, the bill to exempt from duty certain vessels, equipment and repairs; and

H.R. 12920, the Peace Corps bill.

Conference reports and other measures may be called at any time.

Senators are urged, in arranging their schedules, to consider the strong possibility of rollcall votes daily from here on, keeping in mind that a "glut" of legislation is beginning to accumulate.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate—and the distinguished assistant Republican leader has indicated he has nothing else for the moment—I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjourment until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:21 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 1, 1974, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30, 1974:

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

William C. Turner, of Arizona, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for the terms indicated:

For the remainder of the term expiring March 26, 1976:

Virginia Duncan, of California, vice Thomas B. Curtis, resigned.

For a term expiring March 26, 1980:

Durward Belmont Varner, of Nebraska, vice Jack J. Valenti, term expired.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Stephen A. Nye, of California, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1970, vice David S. Dennion, Jr., resigned.

U.S. TAX COURT

Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., of New York, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term expiring 15 years after he takes office. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

William E. Simon, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

David Robert Macdonald, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mary T. Brooks, of Idaho, to be Director of the Mint for a term of 5 years.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 30, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

If My people, who are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and will heal their land.—II Chronicles 7:14.

Almighty God and Father of us all, on this day when the call to prayer comes to us as a nation, teach us to pray and to so pray that in Thee we may find strength for every day, wisdom for every hour, courage for every minute, joy for every second, and love for all of life.

Thou hast promised forgiveness to all those who with hearty repentance turn to Thee. Pardon and deliver us from all our sins as a nation, conform and strengthen us in all goodness, and unite us in mind and heart that we may be one people living with new life, thinking great thoughts, fruitful in our faithfulness to Thee, and compassionate in our concern for one another.

We pray for our President, our Vice President, our Speaker, our Members of Congress, and our leaders in all areas of government, business, and labor. May they feel Thy presence near and in the assurance of Thy love find deliverance from every evil way.

We pray for all the citizens of this free land. May they learn to live together in peace and with good will seeking the welfare of all.

We offer our prayer in the spirit of Him who calls us to pray with Him: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on Earth." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to an amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1647. An act to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

WATERGATE COVERUP

(Mr. RIEGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the American people were invited by the President last evening to join him in the continuing Watergate coverup.

Those censored transcripts from technically unverified tapes are the equivalent of the apple in the Garden of Eden. If we accept such transcripts, no one in America will ever know for sure whether

we learned the full truth—or whether justice was really done.

There is only one way to finally establish the President's true role in White House inspired crimes:

First, the House Judiciary Committee must be given the original tape recordings they have subpenaed, as constitutional law requires.

Second, and critically important, a panel of technical experts must carefully test and verify the integrity of the tapes. We must have independent proof to establish whether portions of conversations have been re-recorded, erased, or spliced out. Given the known history of missing and deliberately erased tapes, technically unverified tapes or censored transcripts are worthless.

America must avoid the thicket of censored and technically unverified tapes—and push forward until we have the truth—the full truth. To do otherwise would abandon our system of justice and our own integrity.

NATIONAL DAY OF HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER

(Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Senate has passed a resolution (S.J. Res. 183) designating today, April 30, as a National Day of Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer. Although the House did not act on this resolution, I am confident every Member will agree it is worthy of our attention today, and every day. Beset by problems and crises on every side, it is well to remember that this Nation was founded on faith in our Creator and we must renew that faith constantly.

Let us acknowledge in humility our dependence on divine guidance. Let us make our deliberations and our decisions in the sure knowledge that sincere prayer is, indeed, answered. If we act in humility and with a prayer for guidance, our land will be healed.

CONGRESSIONAL COUNTDOWN ON CONTROLS

(Mr. STEELMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 43d and hopefully the last day of the "congressional countdown on controls" begun on January 28. Over 30 of my colleagues have joined me in 1-minute speeches citing dislocations of the economy that have resulted from wage and price controls. Their poignant testimony of letters from constituents, various regional dislocations and analyses from newspapers and magazines has provided a vivid picture of the unfortunate manifestations of controls on the local level that is reflected in such abysmal national economic indexes.

Figures for 1973 show consumer prices increasing 160 percent faster than in the previous 2 years at 8.8 percent and wholesale prices rising at almost twice the rate of 1972 and over four times the rate of 1971 at 26.7 percent. This year, wholesale prices, often an indication of what is ahead for future retail prices, climbed again in March at a seasonally adjusted rate of 15.6 percent a year.

Joining me in this "congressional countdown on controls" were the following: BILL ARMSTRONG, ROBIN BEARD, CLAIR BURGENER, JOHN N. "HAPPY" CAMP, THAD COCHRAN, PHIL CRANE, RON DELLUMS, BILL FRENZEL, BEN GILMAN, TENNYSON GUYER, JOHN HAMMERSCHMIDT, HENRY HELSTOSKI, MARJORIE HOLT, ROBERT HUBER, JAMES JOHNSON, JACK KEMP, WILLIAM KETCHUM, CARLETON KING, DAN KUYKENDALL, CLARENCE LONG, TRENT LOTT, STAN PARRIS, JOEL PRITCHARD, JOHN RARICK, JOHN ROUSSELOT, SAM STEIGER, STEVE SYMMS, DAVID TREEN, VICTOR VEYSEY, and ED YOUNG.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only time to end wage and price controls, but it is over time. Working people, businessmen, the housewife are all tired of the political maneuvering with regard to controls that seems to be once again on the forefront of the Nation's media. These people do not want standby authority or partial wage and price controls or any more meddling in the economy. The American people know, believe in, and want the give and take of supply and demand and can plan ahead if the marketplace is run on this traditional principle.

The time is now, the answer is simple. All vestiges of wage and price controls must go—and they must go now.

TWO BILLION DOLLARS NO HANDOUT

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in 1970 postal reform was sold to the American people and to the Congress largely on the basis of the need to eliminate continuing deficits in the Post Office.

The first recommendation of the Kappel Commission was that the Postal Service should "operate on a self-supporting basis." Americans throughout the land were implored to support postal reform, both financially and otherwise, in order to end the "deficit-ridden Post Office."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Congress and the American people were victimized beyond belief by the postal reformers.

As I pointed out here yesterday, the postal deficit has doubled since 1970. In this fiscal year the total gap between postal revenues and postal costs will be $2.4 billion, $2 billion of which will come as a direct subsidy from the Federal Treasury.

And I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that only a little more than a year ago, on March 7, 1973, on the CBS morning news, Postmaster General Klassen, when asked about his relations with Congress, was quoted as saying:

I'm not going with my hand out for more money, so I really don't give a damn what the politicians say.

NATIONAL DAY OF HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today, millions of Americans all over the country will be spending a few moments in reflection and prayer, both individually and in collective thought, asking forgiveness for our transgressions and for rededication to the goals that have made this Nation great.

In 1863 President Abraham Lincoln proclaimed April 30 of that year as a national day of humiliation and prayer. Then, a nation torn by civil war was struggling to find a national purpose. Today, though we are not at war, there is similar despair.

Today, as in 1863, a "national response unmatched for enthusiasm by anything short of major tax cuts"—according to the front page of today's Washington Post—has resulted from a similar resolution passed by the other body, and introduced by Senator MARK O. HATFIELD, designating April 30, today, as a National Day of Fasting, Humiliation, and Prayer.

I have introduced a similar resolution in the House as have my colleagues JOHN B. ANDERSON and FRANK HORTON.

Even though the House has not acted upon this resolution, church groups, clubs, and individuals throughout the 16th Congressional District of Ohio are participating in this call to faith and purpose.

As I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives, I am reminded that our national motto placed above and behind the Speaker's rostrum in this Chamber in 1965 "in God we trust," marks the path we must follow to retain the confidence necessary to our form of government.

Let us take time to contemplate and reevaluate our purpose so that together and with God's guidance we shall attain the lofty goals our forefathers have set.

VERIFIED TRANSCRIPTS WILL BE ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTS

(Mr. MARAZITI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARAZITI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan just a few moments ago referred to the transcripts submitted by the President as censored transcripts. Perhaps the gentleman from Michigan has missed a vital point made by the President that he will submit the original tapes for verification by the chairman of the committee, the the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Let me say very simply that I have faith and confidence and trust in Mr. RODINO, the chairman of the committee, a member of the majority, to properly verify these tapes with Mr. HUTCHINSON,

and certainly they will not be, therefore, censored transcripts but accurate transcripts.

ENVIRONMENT AND POLITICS

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, thinking men and women live with a responsibility to preserve and protect their environment. The ecological cycle of which all living things share must be guarded with a reverence that is above narrow partisan interests because should this delicate cycle ever be carelessly regarded, and broken, life could not be sustained.

I can think of no worthier cause to champion than that of guardian of Nature's interests. I can also think of no graver or more serious responsibility—one which demands dispassionate and intelligent stewardship. To remain a viable and respected environmentalist one must never subject the imperatives of Nature to the changes of politics. The needs of the environment should never be politicized.

Unfortunately, there are groups in this country who masquerade as environmental protection societies only to advance their own narrow political interests. The American people should beware of such sham organizations for it is by their maneuverings that our vital environmental interests will be lost in the shuffle of confusing partisan thrusts.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge Congress to always consider environmental legislation on the basis of its substance and not on its politics.

A CONTEST OF WILLS

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the issue involving whether the President's speech of last night constitutes sufficient compliance with the subpena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary is an issue that transcends just the contents of the transcripts, and as to whether they, in fact, are accurate reflections of what is contained on the tapes.

What is really involved here is a contest of wills between the Congress and the President. Is the will of the Congress to procure evidence in the possession of the President as strong as the will of the President to resist giving up any of that evidence? If the Congress permits the President to do less than comply fully with the subpena, that question has to be answered that the President's will is stronger than is the will of Congress.

The President has no right to determine the extent, the nature, and the scope of the inquiry into whether he has committed impeachable offenses. If he has that right, he can determine its result. The constitutional responsibility is on the part of the House to determine the nature, the scope, and the extent of the inquiry, and if we permit the President in any way to erode that constitutional authority, we do the institution of Congress great damage.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY SHOULD BE SATISFIED WITH THE OFFER WHICH HAS BEEN MADE BY THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House Committee on the Judiciary should acquiesce in the offer which has been made by the President to submit transcripts of all of the taped conversations which the committee has requested in its subpena, with the further provision that the accuracy and the completeness of these transcripts would be verified by the chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member of the committee who would have access to all of the tapes which our committee has requested in the subpena.

If the purpose of our committee is to secure information—and that is the purpose—then procedure would seem to provide a sufficient answer to our demand for information.

As has been stated here earlier, the form in which the committee is receiving its information from the other taped conversations is in the form of transcripts. That is the only practical form in which we can review and study the evidence, that is, in the form of transcripts of the taped conversations. We cannot sit there—38 members of the committee—with earphones on and listen to all of these taped conversations.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of my present information I feel that this is a good and adequate response.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ar-Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 191]

Anderson, Ill.	Ford	Quie
Bafalis	Fraser	Rangel
Blatnik	Gray	Reid
Broomfield	Gubser	Roberts
Brown, Calif.	Haley	Rodino
Buchanan	Harrington	Roncalio, Wyo.
Burke, Calif.	Hébert	Roncalio, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Karth	Rooney, N.Y.
Chappell	Kazen	Rose
Chisholm	McSpadden	Rosenthal
Clark	Milford	Shuster
Cleveland	Murphy, Ill.	Sikes
Cohen	Myers	Skubitz
Conyers	Nix	Steiger, Ariz.
Coughlin	Owens	Stokes
Devine	Parris	Stubblefield
Diggs	Patman	Stuckey
Dorn	Pickle	Traxler
Drinan	Pike	Vander Jagt
Findley	Powell, Ohio	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 374 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1974, TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 14462, THE OIL AND GAS ENERGY TAX ACT OF 1974

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, May 4, 1974, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 14462, the "Oil and Gas Energy Tax Act of 1974," along with any minority and/or supplemental views, and also to advise the House that the committee has instructed the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEBELLI) to request a closed rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from kansas?

There was no objection.

FRANKABILITY OF PICTURES AND SKETCHES OF MEMBERS

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing into the RECORD at this point regulations affecting the frankability of pictures and sketches of Members under the Congressional Franking Act as adopted by the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards.

In addition, the Commission has prepared some guidelines designed to assist the Members in determining the proper size, number, and content of such pictures and these are also included.

FRANKABILITY OF PICTURES AND SKETCHES OF MEMBERS

For many years, it has been the usual and customary practice for Members of the House to include pictures and sketches bearing their likeness in mail matter sent under the frank.

The former Post Office Department, which regulated the use of the frank until 1968, had ruled that inclusion of such pictures in franked mail was proper, provided that such pictures did not tend to advertise the Member. There is little doubt that, from 1968 until enactment of the new franking law in December 1973, when the proper use of the franking privilege was, for the most part, determined by each Member, the use of such pictures, in some few instances, had expanded considerably.

During consideration of this matter by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and subsequently by both the House and Senate, it was determined that inclusion of such pictures in mail matter was a valuable tool in keeping constituents informed, thereby assisting Members in performing their official duties. However, in writing this authority into law, the Congress also recognized the possible resultant abuses and, therefore, also adopted restrictive language to the provisions which finally became law. The pertinent provisions [39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(3)(J)] follow:

"§ 3210(a)(3) It is the intent of the Congress that mail matter which is frankable specifically includes, but is not limited to—

"(J) mail matter which contains a picture, sketch, or other likeness of any Member or Member-elect and which is so mailed as a part of a Federal publication or in response to a specific request therefor and, when contained in a newsletter or other general mass mailing of any Member or Member-elect, is not of such size, or does not occur with such frequency in the mail matter concerned, as to lead to the conclusion that the purpose of such picture, sketch, or likeness is to advertise the Member or Member-elect rather than to illustrate accompanying text."

During its consideration of the regulations concerning the use of pictures mailed under the frank, the Commission determined that it would not be possible to cover each and every possible contingency which might arise in the use of such pictures. The Commission concluded, therefore, that it would adopt only those regulations which it deemed to be necessary and that it would also publish guidelines to assist Members in this regard.

The regulations, which follow, are designed to cover only those circumstances where such pictures are clearly frankable or not frankable:

REGULATIONS ON PICTURES AND SKETCHES

1. Mail matter consisting of newsletters, the usual and customary congressional questionnaire, or other general mass mailings, including covering letters in connection therewith, may include as a part of the masthead thereof a picture, sketch, or other likeness of the Member which is in reasonable proportion to the size of the masthead.

2. Press releases which are frankable, if mailed to the communications media, may be accompanied by photographs which are directly related to the subject matter of the press release being so mailed.

The guidelines, which are set forth below, are intended to assist Members of the House in determining the proper size, number, and content of such pictures:

GUIDELINES FOR PICTURES AND SKETCHES

1. Mail matter consisting of newsletters and other general mass mailings may contain pictures and sketches bearing the likeness of a Member of or Member-elect to the House of Representatives.

2. Such matter should not include more than two such pictures or sketches on any one page thereof, and the area covered by such pictures and sketches should not exceed 20 percent of each such page.

3. A picture or sketch bearing the likeness of the spouse or other member of the family of a Member should not be included in such mail matter.

4. Except for a picture which is part of a masthead, the accompanying text of a picture or sketch should consist of more than a caption which merely identifies such picture or sketch.

5. A picture, sketch or other likeness of the Member, which is part of the masthead of such mail matter, should not cover an area exceeding six square inches.

The Commission is cognizant of the fact that the information contained in this announcement does not cover all circumstances which Members may face with regard to the frankability of pictures. Therefore, the Commission wishes to emphasize that we and our staff are always available to assist you with any question you may have in this regard, or for that matter, any other question concerning the use of the frank.

Issued in Washington, DC on April 30, 1974.

MORRIS K. UDALL,
Chairman.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES TO DETAIL PERSONNEL AND TO LOAN EQUIPMENT TO THE BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8101) to authorize certain Federal agencies to detail personnel and to loan equipment to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "Director," and insert "Director."

Page 2, after line 15, insert:

"(C) The Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shall make an annual report at the end of each fiscal year to the Congress concerning the utilization of the provisions of this subparagraph and the additional cost, if any, to the Federal Government resulting therefrom. Such annual report shall be referred in the Senate to the Committee on Commerce and in the House of Representatives to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of this arrangement of a loan for employees?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, briefly explained H.R. 8101 as it passed the House would authorize the Department of Transportation, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to detail personnel and loan equipment to the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, in order to enable him to more effectively carry out his responsibilities to manage and protect our fisheries and wildlife resources.

The Senate amended the bill in two respects:

The first amendment was technical in nature—it merely eliminated the quotation marks after the word "Director" in order to allow for the addition of a new subsection (C).

The second amendment would add a new subsection (C) to require the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to make an annual report to the Congress concerning the utilization of personnel and equipment provided to the Director by the various agencies and the cost, if any, to the Federal Government resulting from the utilization of such personnel and equipment.

On the Senate side, the annual report would be referred to the Senate Commerce Committee and, on the House side, to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Senate amendments are good; they make the legislation more workable, and I recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman this question:

This does not mean an expansion of the Federal payroll, because I understand it uses employees who are already on the payroll?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman it is my expectation that there will be minimal cost associated with the legislation before us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL)?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1071 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1071

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14434) making appropriations for energy research and development activities of certain departments, independent executive agencies, bureaus, offices, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, all points of order against chapters I and II, the provisions of chapter IV under the heading Atomic Commission, Operating Expenses, and Plant and Capital Equipment, and chapter VI of said bill are hereby waived for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1071 provides for an open rule on H.R. 14434, a bill making appropriations for energy research and development activities of

certain departments, independent executive agencies, bureaus, offices, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

House Resolution 1071 provides that all points of order against chapters I and II, the provisions of chapter IV under the heading Atomic Energy Commission, Operating Expenses, and Plant and Capital Equipment, and chapter VI of the bill are waived for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives (unauthorized appropriations).

H.R. 14434 provides a grand total of $2,269,828,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The bill allocates $1,507,760,000 for energy research and development efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission, $571,933,000 for the Interior Department which includes significantly expanded coal research activities, $101,800,000 for the National Science Foundation, $54,000,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency, and $19,000,000 for the Federal Energy Office. expanded coal research activities, $101,800,000 for the National Science Foundation, $54,000,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency, and $19,000,000 for the Federal Energy Office.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1071 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 14434.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I must take issue with the gentleman's statement that this is an open rule when it provides for the waiving of points of order on some four chapters of the bill. This is an amazing rule as far as I am concerned, and I am opposed to it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1071 provides a waiver of order against specified sections of H.R. 14434, a bill to make appropriations for energy research and development for fiscal year 1975. These energy related appropriations have been put into a special bill for the first time in order that they may be expedited. In his testimony before the Rules Committee the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee indicated that the intent is to have these appropriations enacted into law by the first day of the new fiscal year so that planning of energy research and development can progress in an efficient way.

Mr. Speaker, the waiver of clause 2 of rule XXI, which is provided in this rule, is necessary because several appropriations in this bill have not yet been authorized.

The bill contains funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation. Authorizing legislation for these items passed the House last week but has not been enacted into law and thus these appropriations are technically not in compliance with clause 2 of rule XXI.

The bill also provides funds for the Atomic Energy Commission which similarly are not authorized although such legislation has passed both the House and Senate.

The appropriation of funds for the Federal Energy Office is also technically in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, although authorizing legislation has passed both the House and the Senate and the conference report was adopted in the House yesterday.

With respect to the $54 million recommended in the bill for the energy research and development activities of the Environmental Protection Agency there is presently no basic authorizing legislation for appropriations for fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, in general I am not in favor of waiving the Rules of the House. However, as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee pointed out in his appearance before the Rules Committee, this waiver is necessary if we are going to get this appropriation bill through at this time, and therefore, with some reluctance, I support this resolution.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So really we have a rule waiving points of order for three titles here. Is that correct?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. We have a rule waiving points of order on several of the titles.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. But it has the effect of our being unable to amend those three important areas of this bill.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. You can amend, but points of order are waived. As far as amending it is concerned, you can offer amendments.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14434) making appropriations for energy research and development activities of certain departments, independent executive agencies, bureaus, offices, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed—and I emphasize not to exceed—3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14434, with Mr. HAMILTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this special bill before us today provides $2,269,828,000 in new budget authority for energy research and development activities of the Federal Government for 1975. The amount recommended is $66,100,000 over the budget request and represents an increase of about 70 percent over energy research funding for the current fiscal year.

The $2.2 billion which the bill provides will significantly accelerate the Federal program of energy research and development, particularly in the fields of atomic energy and coal gasification and liquefaction. This bill will help move the Nation toward the objective of energy independence.

Major items recommended in the bill include the following: $1,507,760,000 for energy research and development efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission, including funds for accelerated research for the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor, nuclear reactor safety research, development of nuclear materials, space nuclear systems, nuclear fusion, biomedical and environmental research and safety, and plant and capital equipment; $571,933,000 for the Interior Department which includes significantly expanded coal research activities including gasification and liquefaction and mining research efforts and $59.7 million for the Office of Petroleum Allocation; $101,800,000 for the National Science Foundation which includes major funding for solar and geothermal energy research and also basic research involving energy conservation, automotive propulsion, and oil, gas, and coal resources; $54,000,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency to develop methods to control pollutants associated with energy extraction, transmission, production, conversion, and use; $19,000,000 for the Federal Energy Office for the overall management of national energy policy; $8,935,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for energy research and development projects which utilize capabilities developed in the space program; $6,400,000 for the Department of Transportation to continue and accelerate its program of improving the efficiency of energy utilization of the Nation's transportation system.

This bill is a unique product of six of the subcommittees of the Committee on

Appropriations and demonstrates that the House through its committee system possesses the flexibility and capability to meet urgent situations in a timely and responsive manner.

In consultation with the leadership of the House, the Appropriations Committee decided several months ago that it was imperative to move as quickly as possible on energy research and development funding. By doing this, money would be available at the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1 so that progress on energy research and development could proceed as rapidly and efficiently as possible.

Also, by providing these appropriations in a single bill, rather than in six bills as would otherwise be the case, we could gain an overview of the thrust of the Federal energy research and development effort.

The subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations developed this bill, and they have done an excellent job in the conduct of hearings, the review of budget estimates, and the recommendation of funding levels. They have had to increase the speed of their hearings and to work much harder and longer, on top of an already crowded schedule, in order to have this bill before you at this early date.

The six subcommittees that developed this bill are as follows: The Agriculture, Environmental, and Consumer Protection Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), the ranking minority member being the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS);

The HUD, Space, Science and Veterans Subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the ranking minority member on that subcommittee being the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT);

The Interior Subcommittee, headed by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), the ranking minority member being the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE);

The Public Works, AEC Subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), the ranking minority member being the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS);

The Transportation Subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL), the ranking minority member being the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE); and

The Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED), the ranking minority member being the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take further time at this point; however, later I will ask unanimous consent that Members may revise and extend their remarks. I think that it is important that the House have a good understanding of this bill and I am going to yield to the chairmen of these subcommittees to explain their portion of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I offer a comparative summary tabular statement of the bill:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1974 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1975—SUMMARY

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority enacted to date, fiscal year 1974	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	Bill compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational authority) fiscal year 1975
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION					
Environmental Protection Agency: Energy research and development	$6,100,000	$54,000,000	$54,000,000	$+47,900,000	
Total, ch. I: New budget (obligational) authority	6,100,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	+47,900,000	
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUD-SPACE-SCIENCE-VETERANS					
National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Research and development	4,693,000	4,435,000	8,935,000	+4,242,000	+$4,500,000
National Science Foundation: Salaries and expenses	31,600,000	101,800,000	101,800,000	+70,200,000	
Total, ch. II: New budget (obligational) authority	36,293,000	106,235,000	110,735,000	+74,442,000	+4,500,000
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES					
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	10,123,000	43,125,000	43,125,000	+33,002,000	
Bureau of Mines: Mines and minerals	32,541,000	137,108,000	144,308,000	+111,767,000	+7,200,000
Office of Coal Research: Salaries and expenses	123,400,000	283,400,000	283,400,000	+160,000,000	
Fuel allocation, oil and gas programs: Salaries and expenses	36,130,000	70,100,000	59,700,000	+23,570,000	−10,400,000
Office of the Secretary: Energy conservation and analysis	8,300,000	27,900,000	27,400,000	+19,100,000	−500,000
Total, ch. III: New budget (obligational) authority	210,494,000	561,633,000	557,933,000	+347,439,000	−3,700,000
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION					
Atomic Energy Commission:					
Operating expenses	820,385,000	1,009,890,000	1,043,790,000	+223,405,000	+33,900,000
Plant and capital equipment	259,692,000	432,570,000	463,970,000	+204,278,000	+31,400,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	1,080,077,000	1,442,460,000	1,507,760,000	+427,683,000	+65,300,000
Department of the Interior—Bonneville Power Administration:					
Construction		5,500,000	5,500,000	+5,500,000	
Office of the Secretary: Underground and other electric power transmission research	2,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	+6,500,000	
Total, ch. IV: New budget (obligational) authority	1,082,077,000	1,456,460,000	1,521,760,000	+439,683,000	+65,300,000
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES					
Transportation planning, research and development	2,100,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	+4,300,000	
Total, ch. V: New budget (obligational) authority	2,100,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	+4,300,000	
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE-GENERAL GOVERNMENT					
Federal Energy Office: Salaries and expenses	9,360,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	+9,640,000	
Total ch. VI: New budget (obligational) authority	9,360,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	+9,640,000	
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority	1,346,424,000	2,203,728,000	2,269,828,000	+923,404,000	+66,100,000

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, has alluded to the reasons for the bill and the mechanics with which it is being brought to us here today. I concur with the statements of the chairman.

There is only one thing that I think that I should do and that is caution the Members of this body, and the public in general, that just because we pass this energy appropriation bill, having brought it out early, we are not going to see our energy problems go away; but it is a step in the right direction, I hope it will place added impetus on the research that is so vital if we are going to solve this problem in the years ahead.

Of course, this is long-range research, and in most of the programs in this legislation today research is already underway. The hope of the committee is that this will expedite this research and will probably bring about some break-

throughs in the field of energy that will be beneficial.

So I concur in the idea, which is a new one for our committee, of breaking these items that have particular interest in energy research from these six subcommittees and bringing them into this final package. Hopefully, this will expedite research for our future energy needs and problems, but, of course, this is not an immediate answer to some of the problems that we have existing at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, chapter II covers funds recommended for the energy research activities of NASA and the National Science Foundation.

The Foundation requested $252,600,000 for energy-related research. Of this amount $101,800,000 was identified for direct energy research and $150,800,000 was identified for supporting programs. The committee has recommended the full amount requested for direct research. The balance is primarily associated with the Foundation's basic research work, and will be considered in the regular bill.

Mr. Chairman, the President has designated four principal research and development agencies as lead agencies for different aspects of the energy R. & D. effort. The National Science Foundation is one of those four agencies. It has been designated as having the lead role for solar and geothermal research. In fiscal year 1975 $50,000,000 has been provided for solar energy work. These funds will be used to support a variety of proof-of-concept experiments for the heating and cooling of buildings, including the retrofitting of existing buildings with solar collectors. Experiments will also be conducted in cooperation with NASA to advance the technology of wind generator systems. A 100-kilowatt wind generator will be constructed at the Lewis Research Center to test various systems and determine the economic viability of wind energy.

In the geothermal area, the Foundation will attempt to determine whether geothermal resources can be utilized economically and without adverse environmental effects. A hot dry rock experiment will be conducted at Marysville, Mont., and a low-temperature convective facility will be constructed in the Imperial Valley area of California. Both of these experiments will give us a better picture of what we can or cannot expect from geothermal possibilities.

For NASA, the committee identified and recommended $4,435,000 for a number of direct energy research and development projects. NASA is not a lead agency for any energy research discipline—but with their wealth of facilities and talent, it will play a key supporting role. The funds recommended in this bill will augment the work of other agencies in the areas of solar power, engine and aerodynamic research for ground transportation and energy conversion, transmission, storage and conservation systems using capabilities developed in the space program.

Finally, the committee has recommended $4,500,000 to implement the Solar Heating and Cooling Act. These funds are made available to NASA contingent upon the final enactment of this legislation which has passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, all of the funds recommended in this chapter will make a significant contribution in helping our Nation solve what will be a continuing and ongoing energy shortage. Without a strong energy research and development effort, we will continue to be far too dependent on foreign energy sources. The money provided in this chapter and in this bill will make an excellent beginning. But, before closing I want to say a word about the possibility of energy R. & D. duplication. We may as well face the fact that within this bill—even within this chapter—there will be some overlapping or duplication. It may even be useful to promote some duplication. I doubt that the search for a cancer cure is being conducted without research duplication. Some duplication can be healthy. For example, although NSF is the lead agency for solar work, NASA is contributing to the same effort. Last week it announced a new surface coating, invented by an engineer at the Marshall Space Flight Center, that will absorb about 93 percent of the total solar heat radiated by the Sun. This may or may not represent a significant breakthrough in the solar heating and cooling of buildings. But the point is, that a modest level of duplication could produce that cheap, environmentally sound source of energy that we all know is vitally needed.

On the other hand, while some duplication may be healthy, without proper coordination we will waste an enormous amount of money. Energy is a very sexy word today. Unless this committee and the Congress is diligent many sins are going to be committed in the name of energy research. The key is coordination and for some restraint not to throw money at the problem. Many research efforts funded in this bill will wither and die. Some will bear fruit. But if we are going to separate what is workable, from what is unworkable, we will have to coordinate our efforts and put this Nation's limited resources in the right place.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT).

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering the special energy research and development appropriation bill for fiscal year 1975. This bill has assumed major importance because of the nationwide energy crisis. In response to the crisis the Committee on Appropriations has lifted from the budgets of a dozen departments, agencies, bureaus, and offices of Government the estimates for energy research and development for fiscal year 1973.

The separation of energy into a single special bill is not parliamentary necessarily—although politically pragmatic.

Perhaps we can move ahead with a little more alacrity by early and special passage of the energy appropriations bill. Some problems:

We cannot do this with every bill—and when we remove the energy portions from other bills now, we may leave the balance of some future bills without sufficient appeal to pass;

Perhaps we should be accelerating all appropriation bills. Nevertheless, all portions of our bill are worthy of passage now or later;

Our subcommittee is unanimous, on both sides of the aisle;

We were concerned about duplication;

We were concerned about the waste that generally accompanies crash programs; and

We were worried that excess amounts would be allocated to energy, because of the hysteria and crisis syndrome imposed upon us by the few gas lines and fuel shortages, and that other programs, which are just as essential but which have not shared the headlines, might suffer.

In my judgment we should be spending a good deal more on conservation promotion.

Of the grand total of $2.2 billion, only $101,800,000 is for the National Science Foundation and $8,935,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—both of which are for research.

Productive results may not accrue for years, but we must commence now—and continue our research and conservation programs indefinitely.

Greater domestic production of oil, gas and coal are certain to increase prices of energy.

In the long run, we must discover and develop new sources—the best prospects are thermal, solar, wind, and tide. This bill will greatly expedite research in alternate sources of energy.

Basic research is essential. Most of the projects are ongoing—and not just a hysterical reaction to a temporary crisis.

There may be some duplication—but duplication, competition and individual effort are essential if we are to discover new ideas and develop new techology.

This omnibus energy bill, rather than six individual bills as would otherwise be the case, gives us an overview of the thrust of Federal energy research and development efforts. For the next fiscal year the Committee on Appropriations is recommending a grand total of $2,269,828,000 in new budget authority. This amount is $923,404,000 greater than the amounts appropriated for these purposes during the current fiscal year, an increase of almost 70 percent.

Highlights of the bill's $2.2 billion thrust to move the Nation toward the objective of "energy independence" include: $1,507,760,000 for energy research and development efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission; $571,933,000 for the Department of the Interior which includes significantly expanded coal research activities including gasification and liquefaction and mining research activities, and $59.7 million for the Office of Petroleum Allocation; $101,800,000 for the National Science Foundation which includes major funding for solar and geothermal energy research and also basic research involving energy conservation, automotive propulsion, and oil, gas, and coal resources; $54,000,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency to develop methods to control pollutants associated with energy extraction, trans-

mission, production, conversion and use; $19,000,000 for the Federal Energy Office for the overall management of national energy policy; $8,935,000 for the Naitonal Aeronautics and Space Administration for energy research and development projects which utilize capabilities developed in the space program; and $6,400,000 for the Department of Transportation to continue and accelerate its program of improving the efficiency of energy utilization of the Nation's transportation system.

Energy consumption in the United States has grown at a rapid rate since World War II. Since 1950 energy consumption increased about 3.5 percent per year through 1970 and then increased to a rate of about 4.5 percent through the first half of 1973.

During these same years, from 1950 to 1970, domestic production of energy, mainly from oil and gas, grew at about 3 percent per year. By 1970 the growth in domestic energy production had virtually come to a halt, with the only gains coming from small increases in nuclear energy that could be used only for electrical power purposes.

I am particularly familiar with the budget requests of NASA and the National Science Foundation. I can assure you that they are doing important work toward meeting our goal of national self sufficiency in energy.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $8,935,000 for energy related research and demonstration programs to be undertaken by the National Aeronautics and Space Administraton. Of this amount, $4,435,000 is available for direct energy research and development projects in solar power, heating and cooling; engine and aerodynamic research for ground transportation; and energy conversion, transmission, storage and conservation systems studies utilizing capabilities which were developed in the space program.

The remaining $4,500,000 for NASA is provided for initiating demonstration projects in the event of enactment of the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act or similar legislation.

The committee is also recommending $101,800,000 for the National Science Foundation for direct energy research, the full amount that NSF requested and identified as direct energy research.

The Foundation has been designated as the lead agency for solar energy, and for a significant role in geothermal energy research. The amount provided includes $50 million for solar energy research and $22,300 for geothermal energy research.

The Foundation's responsibility for solar energy includes support through proof-of-concept experiments for heating and cooling of buildings; advancing the technology base of wind generator systems; and studying solar thermal, ocean thermal, photovoltaic, and other energy conversion possibilities.

Geothermal experiments will attempt to determine whether geothermal resources can be utilized economically and without adverse environmental effects. These investigations will include a hot dry rock experiment at Marysville, Mont., and a low temperature convective facility in the Imperial Valley of California. Other direct energy research programs will assess many aspects of energy conservation, automotive propulsion, and oil, gas, and coal resources.

During our hearings on these appropriations requests a great deal of testimony was presented which showed that much imaginative research is being conducted now which will have great impact in the near future. The Foundation is already conducting an experiment at four schools. The Fauquier County Public High School in Warrenton, Va., the North View Junior High School in Osseo, Minn., the Timonium Elementary School outside of Baltimore, Md., and the Grover Cleveland Junior High School in Dorchester, Mass., near Boston, to test new designs of experimental solar heating augmentation units.

At the NASA Lewis Research Center in Cleveland work is progressing on a wind generator capable of producing 100 kilowatts of electrical power at a wind speed of 18 miles per hour. This 100-kilowatt windmill is a step toward projected future windmills capable of producing 1 to 2 megawatts each—that is, systems generating millions of watts of electricity.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It represents an effort by our committee to have these appropriations enacted into law by the first day of the new fiscal year so that planning and administration of critical energy research and development programs can progress in the most efficient and timely manner. Abundant, secure, and cheap energy has been one of the key factors in the building of this Nation. Although the United States faces difficult energy problems in the years ahead, I am confident that in the long run this Nation will solve its energy problems.

The Congress must act now to make sure that adequate funds are available for efficient development of new resources, and new methods of utilizing older resources. We must also make sure that in the rush to meet the energy challenge we do not forget the necessity of protecting our environment and resources. This bill will allow a coordinated Federal effort in the field of energy research and development while providing sufficient funds to the Environmental Protection Agency to safeguard our fragile environment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY is in the Middle East on official business this week and therefore, will not be able to vote on the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1975. He has, however, a strong commitment to the passage of this bill and has outlined his views on it in a letter to me. I would like to insert the text of his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

APRIL 29, 1974.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: The Appropriations Committee is to be congratulated for its fine work on the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriations Act for FY 75. This is an extremely important measure and only a matter of great humanitarian concern prevents me from being in Washington to vote in favor of the bill.

This funding proposal assumes great importance because of the continuing energy shortage, and will provide the necessary appropriations to carry forward with "Project Independence" at the most rapid pace possible. As you know, the bill contains a 70 percent increase in funding over last year, and hopefully will significantly accelerate the Federal energy research and development effort, especially as it relates to atomic energy and coal gasification and liquefaction.

In particular, I am pleased with the $54 million provided to the Environmental Protection Agency to develop methods to control pollutants, beginning with energy extraction through end use. Over half of this amount is to be used to initiate commercial demonstration of chemical coal cleaning technology.

Other agencies also receive a substantial commitment. The Interior Department will now be able to undertake extensive research activities on coal gasification and mining, which is so important to Illinois.

The Atomic Energy Commission will be enabled to develop advanced reactors and expand laser research. NASA, DOT, and FEO also will be able to carry forward with important energy-related programs.

In my view, the $2.27 billion recommended by the committee for energy research and development represents a wise investment in our nation's future, and I am hopeful the entire amount will be available for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Environmental and Consumer Protection.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in cooperation with the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), our subcommittee held hearings to determine which items in the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency would be appropriately included in this overall energy package.

The budget request for the Environmental Protection Agency, as submitted to our committee, totaled $191,000,000. However, the committee in reviewing the request determined that $137,000,000 of the request was more directly related to the agency's ongoing programs than to the special energy program. Therefore, the committee has deferred consideration of the $137,000,000, without prejudice, and will consider that portion of the request in reporting the agency's regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1975.

Therefore the committee has recommended an appropriation of $54,000,000 for energy research and development activities of the Environmental Protection Agency. These funds will be used by the agency in their control technology program to develop methods to control pol-

lutants associated with energy extraction, transmission, production, conversion and end use.

The committee recommends that the $54,000,000 be distributed by program as follows:

Complete pilot scale evaluation of fine particulate control technology on combustion sources, $4,000,000;

Demonstrate advanced waste heat control and utilization technology including dry cooling towers and closed loop systems, $3,000,000;

Develop commercially practicable fuel cell designs for both stationary and mobile energy storage and transmission application, $6,000,000;

Demonstrate the commercial application of municipal waste as an energy source for industrial combustion, $1,000,000;

Initiate commercial demonstration of chemical coal cleaning technology, $34,000,000; and

Improve stationary combustion techniques for the control of nitrogen oxide emissions, $6,000,000.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the other items in our bill that are not included here have in no way been jeopardized so far as inclusion in our regular bill for fiscal year 1975. The remaining $137,000,000 will be considered as a part of our regular agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation bill for fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Chairman, I join in supporting the passage of this bill without undue delay.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I join fully in the remarks made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

I would like to point out that the $54,000,000 we included in this bill is for high priority items, such as completing the pilot scale evaluation of fine particulate control on combustion sources, chemical coal cleaning, and fuel cell work. These are needed so we can make the shift back from scarce energy fuels, such as oil and natural gas, to the use of coal in the production of electricity. This is particularly important for the east coast where we are bothered by the emissions from coal-burning generators.

It is in the interest of all of the country that this research be expedited. The committee recognized that. Funds for this important research are included in the bill and, as the chairman pointed out so well, the remaining $137,000,000 of the budget request has been deferred and will be considered along with our regular bill for fiscal year 1975.

I would urge adoption of this section of the bill and of the entire bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), the chairman of the Interior subcommittee which deals with many of the very important aspects of the measure.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the total amount recommended in chapter III is $557,933,000. This is an increase over fiscal year 1974 of $347,439,000. It is $3,700,000 below the budget estimates. The major changes made by the committee were additional funding for research on secondary and tertiary recovery of oil and gas and research on tar sand and heavy oil production.

Also, there is an increase for geothermal research. A $10 million contingency fund in the fuel allocation, oil and gas programs was deleted by the committee because of a lack of authorization. We also reduced the Office of Petroleum Allocation by $400,000, because we felt that their budget was sufficiently reflective of their needs. There is also a small reduction in the energy conservation and analysis account.

The total budget requests were provided for the Office of Coal Research and the Geological Survey. May I say to the members of the committee that I urge each Member to read the hearing record, because there is a tremendous amount of information on the entire energy problem. This committee has been dealing with the energy problem for a number of years. We have, through the years, provided additional funds for energy research so that the agencies we fund have adequate knowledge on the resources of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, may I say also to the members of the committee that this is not the complete energy picture. Most of the reclamation research programs relative to strip mining are not included in this bill. These programs will be reflected in the subcommittee's regular appropriation bill.

Also, the funds for health and safety research and enforcement are not included in this bill but will be contained in the regular bill. Subcommittee hearings have not yet been completed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the members of the committee that several years ago Dr. Pecora, the Director of the Geological Survey and later the Under Secretary of the Interior, stated to the committee that if the United States was to survive as a free Nation, it must have an option of choices for development of its energy. This is why, long ago, the committee began to increase funding for areas such as the Geological Survey and for offshore leasing. The committee tried as best it could to increase the research effort to discover more sources of energy.

Mr. Chairman, I want the committee also to realize that our total Outer Continental Shelf area is 515 million acres, of which 5.6 million acres have been leased, or 1.1 percent. These leases yield currently 11 percent, or about 1,320,000 barrels of oil per day, of the current U.S. total production, which is about 12 million barrels of oil per day.

Also, the committee should realize that two-thirds of the oil in the United States is currently still in the wells. There is money in this bill to provide the Bureau of Mines with the funding necessary for research on secondary and tertiary recovery of oil.

The subject of oil shale is being widely discussed in the United States by a variety of agencies. The committee has funded necessary research in this area, which we feel is tremendously important. There are several high risks in the development of oil shale, particularly in the environmental category. One is the displacement of spoils and the placement of those spoils. The second thing is the problem of water. This land lies in the arid areas of the West where there is a shortage of water. There is money added to the Geological Survey for research in hydrology relating to the six oil shale leases which have or will be granted. The leases will be granted as pilot projects to see what results occur. These leases will be continually monitored including the results of disposition of spoils and water.

There are various processes in the development of oil shale, and the committee has some thoughts about which will be most appropriate. I think the answers will be more fully developed after the research has been conducted.

Mr. Chairman, I think it well to remind the committee that it takes a ton of rock to secure one barrel of oil, so once we begin, the Western part of the United States could well become a desert if caution is not exercised.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to greatly expand coal production, of which we have an estimated reserve of approximately 3 trillion tons and a known reserve of 1.6 trillion tons, we are going to be faced with difficult problems and these problems are going to require a great deal of research and a lot of analysis and discussions. Remember that our current production of coal is only 650 million tons per year.

For instance, in strip mining, there is a problem of reclamation and a problem of water. In the use of coal, we also have the problem of the labor force.

At the current time, according to statistics received by the committee, the average age of the labor force is over age 40, so there is the training of a brand new labor force to be considered.

Mr. Chairman, we are also faced with problems in our transportation industry, and we must also develop better deep-mining technology. Part of the money in the bill today provides for some new work in the deep mining.

In summary, may I say that 50 percent of the coal reserves are on the public lands of the United States; 36 percent of the petroleum, onshore and offshore, is on U.S. public lands; 43 percent of natural gas is on the offshore and onshore public lands; 60 percent of the geothermal resource is in public lands; and 85 percent of the oil shale of the United States is in public lands. The trans-Alaska oil is projected to yield 2 million barrels of oil per day by the year 1978.

From all sources today we domestically produce about 12 million barrels of oil per day, and the total use of the United States is approximately 18 million barrels per day.

Now, when we consider what the total use is we must note that any attempt to meet the escalating use for the future demands: First, future secondary and tertiary oil recovery; second, conversion

of coal to substitute fuels, with environmental safeguards provided; third, the development of geothermal solar and atomic energy; fourth, the fullest use of whatever hydro facilities we have on line at the current time.

Mr. Chairman, the committee urges the support of this research, because we must have it if we are to survive. We also urge that a maximum program of conservation of energy, as well as protection of environment, be completely complied with throughout the United States, because we must remember that fossil fuels are not replaceable.

The Appropriations Committee's decision to present a special energy research and development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975 was in recognition of the "energy crisis." Certainly, such special attention and realistic funding has appeal and will yield results.

Yet, I submit to the ladies and gentlemen of this Congress, that equally devastating crises exist in other areas of our Nation's natural resources such as nonenergy minerals; timber and lumber; and water.

Should this Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, and this Nation fail to see that these other vital and necessary resources are investigated, conserved and used more wisely, then our future will be clogged increasingly with crises and never-ending shortages.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following breakdown and other information for the information of the Members:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

	1974	Estimate 1975	Committee 1975
Geothermal	($2,556,000)	($9,774,000)	($9,774,000)
Develop geophysical, geochemical, and hydrologic techniques for locating geothermal resources	775,000	1,978,000	1,978,000
Identify geothermal target areas and appraise national resource base	747,000	3,252,000	3,252,000
Develop methodology for predicting energy potential and longevity of geothermal reservoirs	748,000	2,852,000	2,852,000
Develop capability to predict environmental impact of geothermal fluid withdrawal	150,000	1,051,000	1,051,000
Develop knowledge of interactions of rocks, minerals, and geothermal fluids at various temperatures and pressures		400,000	400,000
Determine energy potential of deep unexplored geothermal reservoirs	239,000	241,000	242,000
Geological and mineral surveys	($7,567,000)	($30,851,000)	($30,851,000)
Regional geologic hazards mapping		4,500,000	4,500,000
Determine location and properties of coal resources; coal environmental analysis	1,011,000	2,496,000	2,496,000
Develop information leading to expanded onshore exploration possibilities for oil and gas	1,393,000	4,888,000	4,888,000
Identify the distribution, quantity, and grade of oil shale resources	403	1,040,000	1,040,000
Exploration research and uranium resource assessment	1,239,000	4,174,000	4,174,000
Develop energy resource data system		[1] 1,400,000	1,400,000
Assessment of non-energy mineral resource requirements necessitated by expanded energy development		500,000	500,000
Resource and environmental assessment for OCS oil and gas	3,885,000	11,853,000	11,853,000
Water: Investigations on oil shale hydrology and coal hydrology (water needs for development of these resources)		2,500,000	2,500,000
Total	10,123,000	43,125,000	43,125,000

BUREAU OF MINES

Energy	($22,796,000)	($81,108,000)	($88,108,000)
High Btu gasification	7,400,000	22,200,000	19,200,000
Coal liquefaction	1,879,000	27,388,000	27,388,000
Basic research data on chemistry of coal and conversion processes	2,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Combined power cycles—gas turbine, steam turbine	400,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Environmental problems associated with situ oil shale retorting	2,595,000	2,995,000	2,955,000
Stimulation of oil and gas	3,600,000	17,000,000	25,000,000
Heavy oil recovery	3,025,000	4,025,000	6,025,000
Other coal projects	2,712,000	2,712,000	2,712,000
GSA and pay annualization		288,000	288,000
Metallurgy	(785,000)	(3,900,000)	(4,100,000)
Sulfur-oxides removal from power plant stack gases (citrate process)	100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Energy use patterns in metallurgical processing	$200,000	$500,000	$500,000
Extraction of uranium from low grade domestic ores	200,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Geothermal	300,000	300,000	500,000
Mining	(7,460,000)	(52,100,000)	(52,100,000)
Improved coal mining technology	7,460,000	46,200,000	46,200,000
Oil shale mining research		5,600,000	5,600,000
Other mining research		300,000	300,000
Data collection and analysis (Decrease is due to a transfer of a portion of these activities to FEO. Bureau of Mines will still retain basic data collection responsibility)	(4,500,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
Total	32,541,000	137,108,000	144,308,000

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Coal liquefaction	$43,500,000	$79,600,000	$79,600,000
High Btu gasification	25,400,000	37,800,000	37,800,000
Low Btu gasification	19,700,000	49,000,000	49,000,000
Advanced power systems (including $7,500,000 for MHD)	9,600,000	12,700,000	12,700,000
Direct boiler combustion	14,200,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
"Pioneer plant" projects		$42,100,000	$42,100,000
Advanced research and supporting technology; systems studies	$8,600,000	21,637,000	21,637,000
Administration	2,400,000	6,563,000	6,563,000
Total	123,400,000	283,400,000	283,400,000

FUEL ALLOCATION, OIL AND GAS

Office of Petroleum Allocation includes 2,107 positions; implementation of Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act	[1] $23,800,000	$57,200,000	$56,800,000
Office of Oil and Gas; includes 118 positions; emergency preparedness; oil import; etc	2,330,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
"Contingency fund"—contingent upon enactment of Emergency Energy Act	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	
Total	36,130,000	70,100,000	59,700,000

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND ANALYSIS

Office of Energy Conservation; includes 42 positions	$900,000	$6,400,000	$5,900,000
Energy Conservation Research	5,000,000	16,500,000	16,500,000
Office of Energy Data and Analysis; includes 90 positions	$2,400,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
Total	8,300,000	27,900,000	27,400,000

[1] Does not include the $18,000,000 provided in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1974.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Geological Survey

Surveys, investigations, and research

Appropriation, 1974	$10,123,000
Estimate, 1975	43,125,000
Recommended, 1975	43,125,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+33,002,000
Estimate, 1975	

The total amount recommended by the Committee compared with the 1974 appropriation to date, by activity, is as follows:

Activity	Enacted to date, 1974	Committee bill, 1975	Change
Geothermal investigations	$2,556,000	$9,774,000	+$7,218,000
Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping	7,567,000	30,851,000	+23,284,000
Water resources investigations related to energy		2,500,000	+2,500,000
Total	10,123,000	43,125,000	+33,002,000

Funds provided under the geothermal investigations activity will provide for development of techniques for locating geothermal resources, for identification of target geothermal resource areas, for development of techniques for predicting the energy potential and longevity of specific geothermal reservoirs, for assessing the environmental impact of fluid withdrawal from geothermal reservoirs, and for measuring the energy potential of deep unexplored reservoirs.

Under the geologic and mineral resource surveys activity, funds recommended will provide for regional geologic hazard mapping to identify areas where there is a potential for floods, earthquakes, and other hazards. Such an effort will assist in making intelligent decisions with respect to the location of energy facilities. Funds recommended under this activity will also provide for an accelerated program to identify the location and properties of domestic energy resources such as coal, oil and gas, oil shale, and uranium. In addition, the funds recommended under this activity will provide for offshore oil and gas resource investigations and the assessment of environmental problems related to off-shore oil and gas operations.

Funds included in the bill for water resources investigations will provide for assessments of the impact on various hydrologic systems of development of energy resources such as coal and oil shale.

The Committee bill includes $2,625,000 which was transmitted to Congress as a budget amendment in H. Doc. 93-286. These additional funds will provide increased capability for assessment of energy-related offshore environmental problems in target areas for oil and gas leasing.

BUREAU OF MINES

Mines and minerals

Appropriation, 1974	$32,541,000
Estimate, 1975	137,108,000
Recommended, 1975	144,308,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+111,767,000
Estimate, 1975	+7,200,000

The total amount recommended by the Committee compared with the 1974 appropriation to date, by activity, is as follows:

Activity	Enacted to date, 1974	Committee bill, 1975	Change
Energy research	$22,796,000	$88,108,000	+$65,312,000
Metallurgy research related to energy	785,000	4,100,000	+3,315,000
Mining research	7,460,000	52,100,000	+44,640,000
Data collection and analysis	1,500,000		−1,500,000
Total	32,541,000	144,308,000	+111,767,000

The net increase of $7,200,000 above the budget estimate consists of a decrease of $3,000,000 for the Hydrane high-Btu gasification project at Morgantown, W. Virginia, and increases of $8,000,000 for research on stimulation of petroleum and gas production, $2,000,000 for research on tar sand and heavy oil production, and $200,000 for geothermal research.

The Committee believes that an effective short-term answer that research can offer to help solve the energy problems facing the Nation is to develop the capability to recover petroleum and natural gas already located but unproducible by methods now in use. In the course of its hearings, the Committee found that the budget request for this type of research was below that recommended by the interagency working panel which proposed the program for increased oil and gas recovery. The Committee believes that through additional testing, with emphasis on technological development, many recovery methods may provide the means for freeing billions of barrels of oil and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas.

The major component of the energy research activity, other than the oil and gas recovery program discussed above, is an acceleration of several processes developed by the Bureau of Mines for conversion of coal to high-Btu gas and to liquid fuels. In the high-Btu gas program, funds are provided to accelerate completion and startup of the large Synthane pilot plant scheduled for the fall of 1974. Also, a major effort will be made to provide supporting R & D information vitally needed for successful operation of all processes—materals of construction able to withstand high temperatures and corrosive atmospheres, development of valves and apparatus capable of feeding coal and withdrawing char from pressure vessels, and basic engineering data such as for fluid beds operating at high temperature and pressure.

In the liquefaction program, funds are included for the construction and operation of a process development unit for testing the Synthoil process developed by the Bureau. The Synthoil process has proved in the laboratory that even low-grade, high sulfur and ash coal can be converted into a premium quality fuel oil that can be burned in power and industrial plants without exceeding pollution emission standards.

Projects conducted under the metallurgy research activity include the development of the citrate process for removal of sulfur oxides from power plant stack gases, determination of the energy use patterns in metallurgical processing, development of techniques for extraction of uranium from low grade domestic ores, and research on the corrosive effects of geothermal steam on metals.

Under the mining research activity, the bulk of the increase above 1974 is for expansion of the comprehensive coal mining research and development program which the Bureau of Mines initiated in FY 1974 to help to provide the improved mining systems required to assure the continued availability of this vital energy resource at competitive cost with the environmental and other safeguards demanded by society. If coal is to meet the Nation's energy needs, coal production must increase significantly. Present projections show that this increase may require a trebling of production between now and 1985.

Elements of the expanded mining research program include: improvements in coal mine development systems to reduce the time-to-production requirements for underground mining, adoption of the longwall mining method to mining conditions in the United States and automation to improve productivity, automation of the continuous miner to increase the efficiency of the system which produces more than half of our underground coal, development of mining methods and equipment for the efficient mining of thick or pitching coal and lignite seams which constitute a substantial portion of recoverable fossil fuel reserves, and development of technology to predict and control environmental aspects of underground mining such as subsidence, acid mine drainage, coalbed fires, and waste disposal.

The reduction shown in the data collection and analysis activity reflects the transfer of a portion of this activity related to energy to the Federal Energy Office. Included in the 1974 base program for this activity is $4,500,000 for on-going work in data collection and analysis relating to energy.

The accompanying bill contains a prohibition on the use of funds in this appropriation for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974	$123,400,000
Estimate, 1975	283,400,000
Recommended, 1975	283,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+160,000,000
Estimate, 1975	

The total amount recomended by the Committee, compared with the 1974 appropriation to date, by activity, is as follows:

Activity	Enacted to date, 1974	Committee bill, 1975	Change
Coal liquefaction	$43,500,000	$79,600,000	+$36,100,000
High-Btu gasification	25,400,000	37,800,000	+12,400,000
Low-Btu gas/power	19,700,000	49,000,000	+29,300,000
Advanced power systems	9,600,000	12,700,000	+3,100,000
Direct boiler combustion	14,200,000	34,000,000	+19,800,000
"Pioneer Plant" projects		42,100,000	+42,100,000
Advanced research and supporting technology and systems studies	8,600,000	21,637,000	+13,037,000
Administration and supervision	2,400,000	6,563,000	+4,163,000
Total	123,400,000	283,400,000	+160,000,000

The increases provided in this appropriation are to scale-up and accelerate on-going research projects aimed at developing technology for the clean, efficient utilization of coal. The "Pioneer Plant" program, for which $42.1 million is provided, is a new program which will make use of private sector plants which are under construction or in operation for the production of refined fossil fuels. The major purpose of this program is to share the risk with private developers in taking old technology, upgrading it to be consistent with new safety and environmental requirements, and putting it into use with the Federal investment covering only that part of the process which involves significant technical risks. It is anticipated that this program will attract substantial co-sponsorship funding from the private sector.

The Committee is aware that several of the pilot plant projects funded in this appropriation have experienced some cost overruns. The Committee expects the Department to keep it fully apprised of actions taken to reduce these overruns and proposed actions to deal with future overruns.

FUEL ALLOCATION, OIL AND GAS PROGRAMS

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974	$36,130,000
Estimate, 1975	70,100,000
Recommended, 1975	59,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+23,570,000
Estimate, 1975	−10,400,000

The Committee recommendation will provide $56,800,000 for the Office of Petroleum Allocation for carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act.

This is a decrease of $400,000 below the budget estimate. The bill also provides $2,900,000 for the Office of Oil and Gas. The increase over 1974 for the Office of Petroleum Allocation will provide for annualization of funding and personnel provided in the two 1974 supplemental appropriations.

The budget estimate included a $10,000,000 contingency appropriation, the same as provided in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1974. These funds are to be available only upon enactment of the Emergency Energy Act. The Committee bill for 1975 deletes this contingency fund. If additional funds are required by future energy legislation, the requirements can be provided in a future supplemental appropriation bill.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Energy Conservation and Analysis

Appropriation, 1974	[1] $8,300,000
Estimate, 1975	27,900,000
Recommended, 1975	27,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+19,100,000
Estimate, 1975	−500,000

The Committee recommendation will provide $22,400,000 for the Office of Energy Conservation, a decrease of $500,000 below the budget estimate. The bill also provides $5,000,000 for the Office of Energy Data and Analysis.

The purpose of the Office of Energy Conservation is to reduce energy demand growth as rapidly as possible under conditions of acceptable socio-economic impacts. Major functions include developing and implementing voluntary and mandatory energy conservation policies and actions for both public and private sectors; developing motivational education programs on energy conservation for the American public and carrying out an aggressive multi-media public information and consumer awareness program; managing, monitoring and reporting on the Federal agency energy reduction program; providing technical assistance on energy conservation to state, local governments, and others including Federal agencies and the Congress; evaluating the success of conservation actions; and acting as "lead agency" in conducting and managing the Federal R&D program in end-use energy conservation.

Of the $22,400,000 provided for the Office of Energy Conservation, $16,500,000 will be used for energy conservation research in the industrial sector ($6,000,000), the buildings sector ($6,000,000), the transportation sector ($1,000,000) and for various systems studies related to energy conservation ($3,500,000). The remaining $5,900,000 will provide for operating expenses of the Office.

The purpose of the Office of Energy Data and Analysis is to formulate and recommend policy for energy data development, providing a focal point in the Federal government for energy data analysis. This analysis involves monitoring emerging trends in energy utilization and availability; developing models for short- and long-range forecasting of energy conditions; and establishing the interrelationships between energy, other factors of production, and national economic growths. The results of such analytical work are also used in support of energy policy studies.

The $5,000,000 included in the bill for the Office of Energy Data and Analysis will provide for annualization funds provided in the Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1974, and for an additional 40 positions for the Office.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 14434 making special energy appropriations for fiscal 1975 and to urge its adoption by the Members of this House.

The past 6 months have shown us the dimensions of the American energy problem, both now and in the future. Our energy policies have not withstood the country's scrutiny and we must demand new ones.

Our scrutiny revealed that the United States, with about 6 percent of the world's population, is now consuming over 35 percent of the planet's total energy and mineral production. The average American uses as much energy in a few days as half the individuals in the world consume in 1 year. America has been developed with almost unrestricted use of energy or mineral resources. But, we are now seeing indications of the fact that the United States cannot maintain for long its soaring energy demands without major changes in its energy supplies. We are therefore being forced to evaluate our whole energy use pattern. The long-term pattern is complex.

This bill is complex. We are appropriating over $2.2 billion dealing exclusively with significant changes in all aspects of our energy sources, energy consumption, and energy conservation. This involves the expertise of many Federal agencies. I am convinced this is the first significant step toward energy self-sufficiency, toward energy independence. I want to point out to my colleagues a remark Daniel Webster made about a commitment that is especially appropriate today. Almost 200 years ago, he said:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We are beginning to do this. We are beginning to formulate a realistic energy policy for ourselves, and this has been coupled with consultation with other nations concerning global energy problems. We are starting to define some economies we can practice in the use of our energy. And above all, we have begun a concerted search for new sources of energy which we must have—solar energy, geothermal, coal liquefaction, coal gasification, MHD—any new form of energy that may arise from research and has a technical and practical capability to serve us. That is the area where this bill is making a tremendous beginning.

While this bill is not an immediate panacea to our energy problems—it is a beginning. This bill is the first step for the long term. For in the long run, we must look to our potential resources—and make them our usable reserves. It is estimated that our country may have coal resources to last us 300 years, and existing oil and oil shale resources to last us 500 years.

But potential resources are transformed into reserves, not by moving rock, but by expanding the artificial boundaries of geological knowledge and economic availability that separates the two. The potential of our resources can only be realized as a result of applied research. Major development of new technologies will be the key to this.

For instance, we must tap the offshore oil and gas. The U.S. Geological Survey tells us that there is much more oil and gas yet to be discovered in the United States than all the energy we have used up to now in our entire history. The USGS estimates that on our Outer Continental Shelf alone we have reserves of: 181 billion barrels of oil and 899 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Those are incredible figures and we can greatly increase our offshore oil production—with the will to do so.

The bonuses and royalties from the sale of OCS leases brought $8 billion in revenues to the Treasury in fiscal 1974. This is a sum far greater than the entire investment we are making today. An investment, that quite obviously will yield both additional revenues and additional energy to our national economy.

Additionally, the ominous projections for the future do not consider the potential major shift to coal this country can fortunately make. We have enough coal resources to last us 300 years.

Our Nation has been described as the Saudi Arabia of the world in terms of the huge deposits of fossil fuels beneath our surface. This bill makes a tremendous dollar commitment to develop the technology necessary for the orderly development of our vast coal and other fossil fuel resources. It strengthens and accelerates ongoing programs in the Bureau of Mines and the Office of Coal Research aimed at converting coal to new clean burning petroleum substitutes. The utilization of these techniques will enable us to convert coal to clean energy for use in power plants as pipeline gas, for industrial space heating, and for heavy industrial fuel.

This bill provides funds for new programs in an attempt to capitalize on existing facilities and technologies in the private sector to multiply private initiatives in energy research. It funds programs aimed at using coal directly in direct boiler combustion with a clean gas fuel as a result.

If we can minimize the technical problems, if we can produce the coal necessary for these projects, and if we can perfect new mining techniques we could conceivably realize commercial results from this investment by the end of the decade or the beginning of the next.

This bill not only provides funds for new technology to develop our fossil fuels, but it also funds the vitally important work of improving the yield from existing mineral deposits. One important item to accelerate this technology is the committee's action increasing funds for tertiary and secondary recovery.

Tertiary and secondary recovery is one of the essential factors in our achieving energy self-sufficiency that I would like to highlight. The astounding fact is that present oil production methods leave almost one-half to two-thirds of the oil in the ground. This represents a tremendous reserve that we must tap. Vastly increased additional recovery can be achieved through pressurized injections of detergents called "surface active agents" which will remove virtually all the oil it comes in contact with. These surface active agents are expensive and tertiary recovery is a high risk endeavor. Government assistance in the initial stages is critical if we are to reap the

[1] Included in "Salaries and Expenses," Office of the Secretary.

results of this program. The energy gains are potentially tremendous; according to the USGS and the American Petroleum Institute statistics, approximately 38 billion barrels of oil remain to be recovered domestically, yet tertiary recovery could add an additional 50 to 75 billion barrels to that domestic recoverable reserve.

This bill is not an immediate panacea to our energy problem and it would be misleading for anyone to convey that. Indeed, we must dispel such an impression, for the cooperation of the American public is essential if the critical energy conservation policies are to be believed.

And conservation research is a necessary part of this policy. For instance, in this bill we are providing funds for the research of such unexamined areas as the fact that the same amount of energy, when channeled into a sodium bulb, as opposed to the conventional incandescent bulb, will produce many times as much light; the fact that the fuel flow to our steel furnaces varies significantly from furnace to furnace, and a fuel flow management study in Europe has reduced the steel furnace flow as much as 25 percent; we are also funding studies to determine the potential industrial interaction, by that I mean what may be one industry's waste in the form of heated air going up the stack may well be a usable energy form for another industry having to produce heated air; further, we are providing funds to investigate the amount of diesel and petroleum product that is really necessary in producing high grade asphalt. Simple alterations of a few percentage points in the amount of petroleum product necessary in any of these areas could obviously prove a tremendous savings, leaving a significant amount of product available for other use, thus reducing our inefficiency.

Conservation research can also play a significant role in agriculture. For example, instead of the three trips a tractor makes through a field now to plow—turn over the deep soil—till—round discs to break up the clods—and harrow—rake and smooth for planting, the farmer could make one trip if the technology existed for the machinery or attachments that would accomplish all three tasks. That would be a savings of two-thirds of the fuel tractors would use in such operations. I expect conservation, and conservation research, to play a major role in energy economies.

Today, for the first time in history, the House of Representatives is passing a $2.2 billion appropriations bill dealing entirely with major changes in our energy sources, energy consumption, and energy conservation. I strongly recommend this bill, as the first significant step toward energy self-sufficiency, toward energy independence.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), has indicated, this is a special energy research and development appropriations bill.

This is the first bill of its kind in the history of the Congress where a special appropriation has been made to contribute to a solution of the problems of the energy crisis.

The total appropriation recommended in this bill is $2,269,828,000.

In chapter IV of the report, the Subcommittee on Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations—which I am honored to serve as chairman—is recommending appropriations totaling $1,521,760,000 for a number of research and development programs for 1975.

This is the largest item in the bill.

The Committee on Appropriations is concerned about the energy crisis.

Certainly the people of the country are concerned.

And this bill represents a strong and vigorous response and effort to find solutions to the complex problems of the energy crisis.

There are three separate appropriations contained in chapter IV—namely the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Office of Underground and Other Electric Power Transmission Research of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

The largest amount indicated is for the Atomic Energy Commission. This bill, Mr. Chairman, should provide a breakthrough for this Nation to achieve self-sufficiency and independence in energy production in the years ahead.

We are making progress and I would point out that in the United States today, we have 42 nuclear powerplants in operation—54 under construction and 123 plants on order or planned.

We are just beginning to achieve a breakthrough in seeing results from our investment in the past in nuclear power.

Today 6 percent of the electricity which the people of the United States consume is from nuclear power.

With nuclear power we are moving forward with this alternative source of power and we are saving millions—or indeed billions—of gallons of oil and cubic feet of natural gas and large quantities of other fossil fuel in the process.

It is pointed out on page 25 of the report that 1,000 megawatts of nuclear power is equivalent to fossil fuel requirements for one year as follows: 11 million barrels of oil—or 62 billion cubic feet of natural gas—or 2 million tons of coal.

So with nuclear power we are providing a substitute for conventional methods of achieving electricity and, as indicated, we are making a breakthrough—this science and technology is now paying dividends.

Mr. Chairman, in providing the funds in this bill, the Atomic Energy Commission will be doing vital and important research in the following areas:

The liquid metal fast breeder reactor, LMFBR;

Development of other advanced reactors, including the light water breeder reactor, high-temperature gas reactor, gas-cooled reactor, molten salt reactors, among others; and

Other programs include controlled thermonuclear fusion, gas centrifuge technology, solar energy, coal liquefaction and gasification, biomedical and environmental research and safety.

Although there may seem to be some duplications in this bill in certain areas of research, I should point out that all duplication in research is not necessarily bad—especially in the face of urgent and pressing public need and necessity.

I might point out further that any duplication is in the achievement of objectives—not in the particular avenues of research being pursued.

Therefore, the duplication may result in finding the answer to practical alternative sources of energy by achieving a breakthrough in an area not under study by other Federal research and development efforts.

Dr. Edward H. Fleming, Acting Director of the Division of Applied Technology of the Atomic Energy Commission, pointed out during his testimony before our Subcommittee that, for example, there are several alternative approaches to coal liquefaction—the production of gasoline from coal.

He pointed out further that the AEC is pursuing one or more promising approaches to the achievement of this goal not presently in any other research and development program of any other Federal agency.

Current estimates indicate that our total demands for energy will triple in the next 30 years.

We know that the Halls of Congress are darkened almost daily now in a "brownout" to conserve energy.

Shortages of energy have resulted in school closings, industrial and transportation disruptions, inflated prices for power and fuel, growing unemployment and a general slowdown in the real economic growth of this Nation.

The Appropriations Committee feels this is one of the most serious domestic crises in our Nation's history. Although there appears to be some temporary easing of the energy crisis, long-range solutions must be found.

This bill provides both immediate and some long-range solutions to the energy problem.

As we all know, following the Arab oil boycott, Congress moved quickly to provide the executive branch with additional authority to react to the crisis.

Congress has not only been conducting investigations and hearings into the energy crisis, pointing up deficiencies in the administration of the Federal energy program and the lack of full and adequate information on oil reserves held by major oil companies—Congress has also passed vital and important legislation in an effort to resolve the crisis.

This legislation included the Emergency Energy Act, which would have provided for a freeze on prices of "new" domestic crude oil and a rollback of prices within 30 days.

The bill also would have required oil companies to produce vital information concerning their reserves—restricted oil exports—established the Federal Energy Administration, FEA, to replace the Federal Energy Office, FEO—and required electric utilities to switch from oil to coal.

Unfortunately, the President vetoed the bill.

Congress also has passed the mandatory fuel allocations bill which provides the administration with authority to establish a fair and equitable system of distribution of gasoline and other petroleum products.

The implementation of this act, however, has left much to be desired and has created regional shortages with long lines of motorists waiting at service stations for gasoline.

Congress passed the Alaska Pipeline Act which will make available large additional quantities of oil from the north slopes of Alaska, from lands owned by the Federal Government.

To conserve energy Congress passed legislation recommending that States reduce automobile speed limits to 55 miles per hour.

Congress is also moving forward with legislation to provide for a national system of strategic reserves and a massive energy research and development program.

Notwithstanding these actions by Congress, it is imperative, in the meantime, that we as a nation think conservation—we must practice conservation—we must teach our children to practice conservation.

Indeed we have been warned that we must make conservation a way of life for the American people.

I have confidence that the American people will respond to this challenge, as they have responded in the past.

Energy is the life blood of our civilization—it must be geared to technology which, in turn, can produce our future energy supply and needs.

It is imperative that our long-term energy problems be solved.

I feel that American technology can come through with solutions that in time will ease the shortages and over the long-term develop new and improved technology to achieve our goal of energy self-sufficiency for this Nation.

I repeat it is imperative that we find long-term solutions to the problem. This bill is an important step in this direction. This special energy appropriations bill is a response to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor and the time, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to make further comments on the energy crisis and express my views on actions that need to be taken in addition to the passage of the pending research and development funding appropriations bill.

The Federal Energy Office has provided a liberal supply of words and claims and announcements of new allocations and revisions of prior allocations—and yet for months the long lines continued at service stations and there was no appreciable relief. Fuel prices continue to rise higher and higher—and they are still high.

Administration pronouncements on the energy crisis have tended to confuse the American people—one official announced on one day that we were in a short-term crisis that would be over this year—the following day another official told this official to keep "your cotton pickin' hands off energy policy" and insisted the crisis would last for years.

Our people do not want words—they need assurance of adequate supplies of energy—the lifeline of our Nation's economy.

The President said in a recent press conference—on February 25 last—that the energy crisis has passed although a problem remains.

Other administration officials insist that the crisis remains. This special energy appropriations bill is one answer and response to the problem.

Certainly we all hope the crisis or problem—will pass, but we are all apprehensive over the possibility of another sudden "crisis" and another siege of higher prices.

Many service stations are closed on interstate highways and in our cities, small towns and rural areas. Many are open only a part of the time—many are closed on weekends.

Unemployment is a problem as the impact of the shortages bites deeper into industrial production and forces more service stations and other small businesses to close.

My personal evaluation is that, all things considered, the crisis remains with us—it is not as apparent now, but the Damocles sword hangs over our head—and the fine thread holding the blade is indeed tenuous.

Our people need to know the facts and they need to know where they stand with respect to oil and gas shortages.

The key to the situation is securing the facts on petroleum reserves from the major oil companies so the Nation will know and understand what the true situation is at this time.

William Simon, formerly Director of the Federal Energy Office and now Secretary of the Treasury, said recently that audits by the Federal Energy Office indicated the oil companies were providing correct figures in oil reserves.

This raises any number of questions.

Mr. Simon insists there was an oil shortage—we all know that.

The question is: Why? Why?

Was the shortage deliberately created, as the Federal Trade Commission investigation indicates? Or was the shortage unavoidable?

In my view the oil shortage was in large part contrived—but got out of hand because the oil companies did not anticipate the Arab boycott.

Some of us in Congress who have been observing the development of the energy crisis have warned for some time that demand was exceeding projected supplies of petroleum products.

The House Small Business Committee, which I am honored to serve as chairman, in 1970 conducted investigations and hearings which laid bare the potential for a monopolistic concentration in the energy field—with "big oil" controlling not only all phases of the petroleum industry—but competing sources of energy as well—coal, natural gas, and uranium.

Testimony and evidence introduced at these important hearings outlined the dimensions of the "big oil" takeover of competing energy sources.

This is the picture that emerged:

Major oil companies were rapidly becoming energy conglomerates by acquiring competing energy resources in apparent violation of antitrust statutes;

Major oil companies account for 84 percent of all refining capacity in the United States;

Major oil companies account for 72 percent of all natural gas production and reserve ownership;

The four largest oil companies account for about one-third of all coal production in the United States; and

Major oil companies own half of all uranium deposits.

Therefore, based on available evidence, it is clear that "big oil" had set about to deliberately restrict supply to drive up prices—however, the Arab oil embargo turned a shortage into a crisis—and the American people were caught in the middle, paying monopoly prices.

Our committee called these facts to the attention of the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission, and also urged that these agencies use their antitrust powers to break up these big oil combines.

It was not until July of 1973 that the Federal Trade Commission finally filed an official complaint and not until February of 1974 that a bill of particulars was filed, detailing the workings of the monopoly and requesting that the big oil companies be divested of their refining operations to assure competition and an adequate supply of gasoline and other petroleum products.

This complaint will be tried first by an administrative law judge at FTC—and, according to FTC spokesmen, is expected ultimately to go on appeal to the full Commission and then an appellate court before a final decision is rendered—possibly by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Finally confirming the findings of our Committee, this official FTC complaint said:

Respondents (Exxon, Texaco, Gulf, Mobil, Standard Oil, Shell, and Atlantic Richfield) control, directly and indirectly, a substantial portion of the market's refining capacity and are able to exercise monopoly power at this level of production because of the formidable barriers to entry (by independent refiners) they have erected.

(The big oil companies') behavior threatens the viability of independent refiners and marketers resulting in losses to consumers . . .

Major oil firms, which consistently appear to cooperate rather than compete in all phases of their operation (the promotion, distribution and sale of gasoline) have behaved in a similar fashion as would a classic monopolist: they have attempted to increase profits by restricting output . . .

(The big oil companies) and some other large integrated firms have forsaken resort to genuine markets, preferring instead an artificial structure of non-market institutions resulting in costly distortions and anti-competitive exclusions of independent rivals.

Indeed, had the petroleum industry been organized to depend upon free markets, it is doubtful that the present shortage of refinery capacity would have arisen.

The complaint calls for a return to an open market in the oil industry and asks for divestiture of 40 to 60 percent of the companies' refining capacity by establishment of 10 to 13 new firms. The complaint also calls for divestiture of some pipeline assets to break up the monopoly within the oil industry itself.

As American motorists wait in long

lines for gasoline, we hear that Exxon—the world's biggest energy company—earned profits last year of $2.4 billion—a 59 percent increase over 1972.

And the profits of all major oil companies have increased by huge percentages.

Texaco, the largest seller of gasoline in the United States, pocketed profits last year of $1.3 billion—an increase of 45 percent.

Gulf earned $800 million, for an increase of 79 percent.

British Petroleum hiked its profits in the first 9 months of last year by an incredible 483 percent. Its earnings during that period amounted to $204 million.

Mobil earned $843 million last year—an increase of 47 percent.

Royal Dutch-Shell pocketed $1.1 billion—an increase in profits of 139 percent.

And California Standard hiked its profits by 54 percent to $843.6 million.

Profits for the first quarter of this year tell the same story.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations and as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, your Representative has been warning for several years that the policies of the major oil companies, coupled with increased use of energy, could create a shortage unless action was taken.

In my view, the Justice Department should assist the Federal Trade Commission in prosecuting to the fullest extent the suit filed in Federal court to accomplish the goal and objective of breaking up the "big oil" combines and returning competition to this industry.

I am very much in favor of curbing the windfall profits of oil companies.

The oil companies should not profit from the crisis and its hardships on the American people.

I am in favor of tax reform to close the tax loopholes that permit the big oil companies to pay a very small percentage of taxes on their incomes—I favor elimination of exorbitant overseas tax credits that permit the big oil companies to charge off royalties they pay other nations as tax credits.

I favor an intensive audit of the major oil companies' books and records of their reserves—to determine the nature and extent of any shortage—and to determine whether the shortage is as serious as reported—real or contrived.

I favor proper Government regulations and control over all oil exports during this time of crisis.

Americans enjoy the world's highest standard of living—and yet Americans today are worrying about whether they will have gasoline tomorrow to drive to work. Real and free competition in the oil industry will contribute to energy self-sufficiency for this Nation.

This Nation must become self-sufficient and not dependent on foreign sources for its energy resources.

Congress is pressing forward and continuing to provide funds and legislation to assist in the solution of these problems—problems of shortages and unemployment.

I am convinced that a good dose of private enterprise—competition in the marketplace—will cure many of the defects and evils of the petroleum monopoly—and provide for greater refining capacity—keener competition—and a healthy, vigorous, competitive industry that is so desperately needed to help solve the energy crisis.

I favor these additional actions and certainly will lend my efforts to assist in a solution to the continuing problems of the energy crisis—in the public interest.

I have listened to literally months of testimony on energy problems—and reports by our committee dating back to 1970 have issued warning after warning and made recommendation after recommendation which were all too often ignored.

One of the major reasons for my continuing battle with the Office of Management and Budget is the continued practice of impounding funds appropriated by our Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations for projects which produce electric power or fund research and development into new alternative sources of energy.

This arbitrary and capricious impoundment of funds has not only delayed projects beneficial to our people, but also has increased the costs of construction on many projects.

I would point out that in 1 year—fiscal 1971—the administration impounded all public works projects which were added on by Congress following weeks and weeks of hearings and a careful analysis of problems and priorities.

This had the effect of delaying power on line—availability of urgently needed water supplies—flood control—navigation and other benefits for at least 1 year.

It was estimated that this impoundment cost the American people $242 million in added costs and benefit losses.

This certainly shows that Congress was in 1971 endeavoring to meet anticipated increases in energy demands—but that OMB and others in the administration deliberately halted and slowed down public works projects needed to provide these essential services to an expanding population.

I am pleased to report that the budget for 1975—after the energy crisis developed—was more generous in its recommended funding of public works projects and research and development into new sources of energy.

OMB officials now suggest that the word "impoundment" can be retired from our vocabulary.

The current energy crisis and the blackouts, brownouts and electric power shortages that have occurred underline the shortsighted deficiencies in the prior policy of arbitrary impoundment of funds for public works projects.

My Subcommittee on Public Works and AEC Appropriations has long recognized the need to move ahead with public works projects on a planned and consistent basis in line with the needs of the people of our great Nation.

Also, we have moved forward with substantial appropriations for energy research and development.

During the past 5 years, our subcommittee has approved almost 80 percent—or $5 billion—of all appropriations provided by Congress for energy.

Thus the Congress has been farseeing. The Congress has provided some funds for research and development—looking to long-term solutions to our energy problems.

The magnetohydrodynamic technology, for example, is another vital and important line of research currently considered desirable. This research concept is being explored in research by the Arnold Engineering Development Center and University of Tennessee Space Institute, both at Tullahoma, Tenn.

Coal-fired MHD generators could increase the efficiency of steamplants by as much as 40 to 60 percent.

Much of the research provided for in this bill will be carried out at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory at Oak Ridge, Tenn.—one of the great laboratory facilities of the AEC.

Coal gasification and liquefaction research under the direction of the Office of Coal Research, Department of the Interior, is also most important because the Nation has more coal reserves than any other fuel.

Coal gasification is the production of natural gas from coal—and liquefaction, as I indicated earlier, is the production of gasoline from coal.

Funds provided in this bill will not only help solve the problems with which we are faced now, but are aimed at finding solutions which will enable our great Nation to be self-sufficient in energy in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, in the appropriations bill for 1973 and 1974, the Subcommittee on Public Works-AEC Appropriations, pointed out the dangers of the energy crisis, warned of the potential for the energy crisis, and made comments in the report of the need to accelerate appropriations to find solutions.

I call your attention to pages 23 and 24 of our report, which sets forth our views at that time, which have been repeated.

I would point out further that the President sent a special message to the Congress on January 23, 1974, on the energy crisis.

The President has addressed most of his remarks to the legislative committees, calling for legislation. The Appropriations Committee is responding by providing appropriations and funding for solutions.

For operating expenses for the AEC we are recommending in this bill $1,043,790,000. This is $223,405,000 more than last year, but all of which is budgeted.

The committee has added $33,900,000 for operating expenses above the budget.

In other words, the administration and the Office of Management and Budget—at long last—have recognized the need for increased funding and have recommended an increase of $223,405,000, to which amount the committee has added $33,900,000.

I want to point out again concerning nuclear power "on line" that today we have 42 nuclear power plants in operation, 54 under construction, and 123 on order or planned, making a total of 219.

We are truly making progress in achieving a breakthrough with this tech-

nology, as 6 percent of our Nation's electricty is now nuclear powered.

This percentage will expand with nuclear plants providing over 20 percent of America's electric power by 1980.

SAFETY OUTSTANDING

Let me stress at this point that the Atomic Energy Commission's safety record is outstanding—there have been no death or tragedies from nuclear accidents as extensive safety precautions are provided in both construction and operation of nuclear powerplants.

I would point out that safety is "sprinkled" throughout the budget for AEC, both in research and development, in design of facilities, construction, inspection and in operation.

The record for safety is outstanding, and the fears and concerns and alarms over the dangers of nuclear radiation thus can be minimized because of the safety factors provided.

PROJECT INDEPENDENCE

America's large and expanding reliance on imports for sources of energy was dramatically exposed during the Arab oil embargo. The results of that embargo were unemployment in various industries, the threat to national security, soaring costs for fuel, the potential of a deep recession if the embargo were continued.

These considerations have led to the emergence of a national goal of attaining self-sufficiency in energy—that is "project independence".

While some witnesses testified before the committee that the goal of self-sufficiency by 1980 was overly optimistic, they nevertheless supported the concept of the policy and urged that America proceed at a rapid pace to attain this goal.

I believe the goal can be achieved.

For instance, the presently operating light-water reactors utilize only 1 to 2 percent of the potential energy in uranium. In the development of the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor, when operational, this plant, experts advise, will utilize uranium from 30 to 40 times more efficiently.

The liquid metal fast breeder reactor may be the answer to the solution of our energy problems, as the fast breeder reactor is designed to produce more fuel than it consumes.

On page 27 of the report is a breakdown of the recommended appropriations for operating expenses of the AEC.

It must be noted, in most instances, that the budget estimates for 1975 have been substantially increased over 1974 and that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended the budgeted amounts or the amounts recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

In four instances the committee has recommended increases and in four instances the committee has recommended some decreases from the authorization level.

The increases are for civilian reactor research and development for a total of $11,200,000, controlled thermonuclear research $9 million.

The decreases recommended are $3.7 million for applied energy technology, $1.2 million for changes in selected resources, $12 million in modification of gaseous diffusion plants—with $20 million being provided in the bill—we think this is adequate—and a $3 million reduction for the Cascade uprating—a $10 million increase over previous recommended amounts will provide adequate funding for this program.

The table for operating expenses follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating Expenses

Program	Fiscal year 1974 appropriation	Budget estimate fiscal year 1975	Committee bill	Bill compared to budget estimate
Nuclear materials:				
Source materials	$1,950,000	$5,700,000	$5,700,000	
Process development	30,175,000	35,055,000	35,055,000	
Total nuclear materials	32,125,000	40,755,000	40,755,000	
Weapons:				
Weapons activities:				
Research and development (laser fusion only)	34,300,000	44,400,000	44,400,000	
Advanced isotope separation technology	1,475,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	
Total weapons	35,775,000	55,100,000	55,100,000	
Civilian reactor research and development:				
Central station power development	193,890,000	263,900,000	273,100,000	+$9,200,000
Cooperative power reactor demonstration	20,000,000	14,000,000	16,000,000	+2,000,000
Nuclear safety	31,500,000	40,110,000	40,110,000	
Technology and engineering	45,000,000	67,500,000	67,500,000	
Total civilian reactor research and development	290,390,000	385,510,000	396,710,000	+11,200,000
Reactor safety research	40,683,000	52,940,000	52,940,000	
Applied energy technology	13,650,000	31,820,000	37,020,000	+5,200,000
Space nuclear systems	700,000	800,000	800,000	
Physical research:				
Nuclear science	$6,300,000	$7,600,000	$7,600,000	
Materials sciences	9,400,000	18,500,000	18,500,000	
Molecular sciences	5,800,000	16,800,000	16,800,000	
Total physical research	21,500,000	42,900,000	42,900,000	
Controlled thermonuclear research	53,000,000	82,000,000	91,000,000	+$9,000,000
Biomedical and environmental research and safety:				
Biomedical and environmental research	88,000,000	116,500,000	116,500,000	
Waste management	5,913,000	10,515,000	10,515,000	
Total biomedical and environment research and safety	93,913,000	127,015,000	127,015,000	
Program support:				
Operational program direction	69,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	
Information services	5,369,000	6,660,000	6,660,000	
Total program support	74,369,000	86,660,000	86,606,000	
Total program costs funded	656,105,000	905,500,000	930,900,000	
Change in selected resources	164,280,000	104,390,000	112,890,000	+8,500,000
Total operating expenses	820,385,000	1,009,890,000	1,043,790,000	+33,900,000

Some additional specific recommendations include:

Nuclear materials—$40,755,000, $5.7 million of which amount is for analysis and evaluation of U.S. uranium ore reserves.

Presently uranium ores are being purchased from Canada and from a number of the Western United States, and there are other areas of source materials for which an evaluation of supply needs to be made.

For reactor safety research, the committee recommends $52,940,000, as we are all concerned—the Nation is concerned—about reactor safety from the inception of reactor planning, construction, to completion and operation.

For controlled thermonuclear research the committee is recommending $91 million the primary goal of this program being development of a new energy source based on the nuclear fusion process.

AEC witnesses testified that many promising breakthroughs have been made which will accelerate the timetable for proving the scientific feasibility of this process.

The committee, as I earlier indicated, recommended an increase of $9 million—for a total of $91 million—for controlled thermonuclear research.

Controlled thermonuclear research is being pushed throughout the Government, and many enthusiasts in the Congress consider that controlled thermonuclear research may be the answer to mankind's long-range energy requirements.

This process will utilize as fuel a form of hydrogen—it is estimated that energy produced by this technology in 1 gallon of seawater will equal the amount of energy obtainable from the combustion of 300 gallons of gasoline. Thus this process, if successful, will provide us with an inexhaustible source of energy.

The hopes of this process are promising—and worth the investment.

The committee is recommending an increase of $5,200,000 for applied energy technology, with $1,200,000 of this increase to be used for solar energy research.

The committee feels that accelerated research in solar energy is highly important and that this technology should be advanced as rapidly as possible.

Within applied energy technology we are recommending funds for the syn-

thetic fuels program, which is primarily a catalytic process for coal liquefaction.

The committee was impressed with testimony which indicated the potential of chemical explosives for in situ oil shale processing. Funds are provided for technological studies and evaluation—but no funds are provided for underground nuclear explosions. I would emphasize that we are interested in the oil shale processing—but none of the funds in this bill are provided for underground nuclear explosions.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the Atomic Energy Commission has more than 25,000 scientists in its employment. The Commission has more than 65 laboratory stations and facilities.

A breakdown of the facilities is as follows:

Headquarters	1
Field offices	11
Major multiprogram laboratories	7
Minor specialized laboratories	20
Testing stations and other facilities	26

Hopefully this vast array of scientists at these laboratories will provide us with some solutions.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, again I would point out that we are recommending for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Office of the Secretary of the Interior for underground and other electric power transmission research a total of $1,521,760,000.

While this is a large amount, increases recommended over the budget estimates are minimal—only $33,900,000 for operating expenses and $31,400,000 for plant and capital equipment—a total of $65,300,000 above the budget.

Certainly we can afford this amount—this increase—as an investment in the solution of the energy problem and a long-range investment in self-sufficiency in energy for this Nation.

The public interest demands fast, decisive, and effective action. I urge approval of this special energy appropriations bill, recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee is the chairman, has not been a Johnny-come-lately group to our effort to solve our energy problems. Through the years I think we, on the subcommittee, have been as much aware as anyone in the Congress in, first, recognizing and, second, in taking some practical steps to deal with the energy problem both in the short term and the long term.

As the chairman mentioned, on page 24 of our committee report there is reference made to some of the language that we used a year ago before people generally seemed to be aware that we did have an energy problem in this country. Not all of the energy sections of this bill can be traced to direct actions to deal with the energy problem; but I think everything that is found in the bill does have a relation to it. For instance, we cannot take some of these steps that need to be taken and are provided for in this bill without dealing with the related problems of safety, environmental and biological research. Provisions are made in this bill for those areas as well.

For those that might be concerned that there are some things in this bill that they cannot identify as directly related to energy research, I think it might be well to keep in mind that when our regular public works appropriation bill is brought to the floor later this year, it will contain language that will merge the appropriations here found with the appropriations that will be later made in the general public works-atomic energy appropriation bill for 1975, thereby providing a total of AEC appropriation for the coming year.

We have recommended an increase of $65.5 million over the budget. This is not generally a happy circumstance. Chairman Ray of the Atomic Energy Commission did indicate to us that the figures in the budget were adequate for the purposes which she outlined; but these increases do represent an accommodation to the strongly expressed desires and the authorizations that were made by the legislation recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, as the chairman has indicated, we did make reductions of between $24 million and $25 million overall from the authorization level which has passed the House.

In this bill, not only in the various sections of it, but within our section as well, there will be found duplications among different agencies of Government working in the same direction.

Perhaps this is inevitable when we deal with a crash program; as our efforts to cope with the energy problem, I suppose, must be so properly described, but sometimes in research a duplication does not always represent a waste. Different agencies, different scientists, and different institutions may take different approaches toward the same goal, and one of them may turn out to be superior to the others.

In this bill, we have laser energy development directed toward civilian orientation. This program has been emphasizing the military side of the program. Funds in this bill will use some of the military developed technology for civilian purposes.

Mr. Chairman, there are many things that are difficult to measure in an appropriation such as this. How—in dealing with laboratories and research institutions and programs that have their payoff way in the future—how does one measure the amount of dollars that may be necessary in order to accomplish the objective? As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) said, we do need to be somewhat careful that we do not attempt to equate extra dollars with extra accomplishments, but what we have done in this bill is to bring to the committee the benefit of our combined judgment as to the dollars that will do the job. Although, obviously people will differ on matters of judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect there will be some amendments to increase the amount of dollars that we have recommended, and I suspect also that there will be some efforts made to increase the dollars that are to be made available. But, this again gets down to a matter of judgment, and we did exercise judgment based upon the facts that were available to us from our hearings and from the recommendations of the capable staff people that we had available to us.

And so, because it is difficult to collate dollars to effort, it may be that we made some mistakes, but I am not aware of any such mistakes. I consider this bill to be a reasonable and prompt response to the energy problem that we have in this country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL).

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Chairman, the United States with 6 percent of the world's population consumes 35 percent of our planet's energy production. That amounts to the equivalent of 35 million barrels of oil per day. By the year 2000, if present trends continue, our Nation will require the equivalent of 95 million barrels per day.

Transportation is by far the Nation's most wasteful user of energy. Our ships, planes and cars burn up 8 million barrels of oil a day—22 percent of all the energy we use. Yet because of the nature of these vehicles, they convert only one-fourth of their fuel into propulsion; fully three-fourths of the energy input is wasted.

If you drive a large, fully equipped automobile, you are losing 90 percent of your energy input.

By contrast, our largest user of energy—industry—and our third largest—residential and commercial—successfully convert more than 70 percent of their fuel into useful work.

In an effort to improve fuel use efficiency in transportation, we are recommending an appropriation of $6,400,000 to the Department of Transportation for its automotive energy efficiency program. Of that amount, $3,950,000 is for automotive component evaluation and testing and $2,450,000 is for the assessment of energy efficient vehicles in the highway system. Although this is the only Department of Transportation program included in this bill, other energy efficiency-related activities of the Department will be funded in the regular fiscal year 1975 appropriation bill.

The Department of Transportation's ongoing automotive energy efficiency program is assessing the technology for improving the effectiveness and flexibility of energy utilization by our Nation's transportation system. The program's major objective is to assess comprehensively the technological capability of the automotive industry to substantially improve the fuel economy of the cars and trucks they produce between now and the end of the decade.

The automotive component evaluation testing portion of the program supports hardware testing and analyses of devices and techniques that offer significant opportunities to improve automobile and truck fuel economy in the next few years. The other major aspect of this program, assessment of energy efficient vehicles in the highway system, seeks to provide the

necessary technical data-base and analytical tools to assess the energy usage, emissions, safety, and economy of the projected highway vehicle fleet.

Unfortunately, the $2.1 million appropriated for this program last year will have little or no impact on the 1975 model automobiles. We have directed that the Office of the Secretary of Transportation report back to us on the direction, progress, results and application of these studies not later than December 31, 1974.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14434, the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriations for 1975.

Over the past few months the startling recognition of the urgent need for increasing our energy supplies has hit home in every American household. We would be hard pressed to find one citizen whose life style was not altered by the energy shortages we have recently experienced.

These shortages have forcefully registered America's need for self-sufficiency in energy. While we are fortunate to have not only many of the natural resources to accomplish self-sufficiency, we also have the necessary technology to progress in that direction. What is needed now, to bring us closer to our energy goals, is massive research and development of our existing and new programs.

Appropriating funds to beef up energy research is a logical and necessary step forward in our search for resolving our energy needs.

The Appropriations Committee has prudently brought before us today a measure incorporating many of the efforts we are making in seeking new sources of energy—farsighted, long-range developments such as solar and geothermal energy are specifically cited, as are plans for interim, short-term energy solutions of securing new sources of fossil fuels and plans for converting coal to a more environmentally sound liquid fuel.

The committee's proposal for this research and development legislation is recognition of the critical urgency of our energy needs. This proposed appropriation is urgently needed and will be wisely spent; we have found that we are a nation whose survival depends upon energy abundance. For this reason, I strongly support this $2.2 billion appropriation of funding for energy research and development and urge my colleagues to join in adopting this measure.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriations bill, but not with great enthusiasm.

This is a shotgun approach to funding our energy programs. We are throwing money at the energy problem, and in this bill we are throwing it eight different ways.

Instead of appropriating separate sums for the EPA, NASA, National Science Foundation, Interior Department, AEC, Bonneville Power Administration, DOT, and FEO, the Congress should be making one appropriation to a single agency.

I hope this appropriations bill serves notice on the Democratic leadership that reorganization bills for the Federal agencies and the House of Representatives are overdue. Enactment of H.R. 11510, the Energy Reorganization Act, is a first priority. This bill passed the House last December, and 5 months later it remains buried in a committee of the other body.

Furthermore, it is time to pass the Bolling plan to put our own House in order.

The type of special energy appropriations bill we are considering today is chaotic, but it is the best we can do under the present setup. Early passage of this bill would at least give the eight Federal agencies a better opportunity to plan for the coming fiscal year.

But this bill will not fill the vacuum that exists where the Federal Government's long-range energy planning mechanism should be. I would remind my colleagues that a special energy funding bill constitutes merely a holding action, not a step forward. If this Nation is to come anywhere close to the goal of project independence, it must have leadership on energy issues in both the administration and the Congress.

I ask my colleagues to consider my plea as this bill is passed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, the section I want to discuss is chapter VI of this bill which deals with the budget for the Federal Energy Office.

The amount provided for here is $19 million, which is a full year's cost at the present rate of operation of this Office. They plan to have about 1,040 people on board.

The history of the Federal Energy Office is that it was originally set up as the Federal Energy Council, and then when the crisis came last year it evolved into what is now a management operation. It will be the control and directing branch of this new Federal energy agency that was approved by the House yesterday when the conference report on the authorizing legislation was approved.

They have two major duties that are, I think, worthy of note in this particular regard. As you know, the first big test of this agency was in the fuel allocation program that the energy crisis brought on. We are all aware that under great stress and difficulty they were able to meet the crisis and got us through the first part of the problem. They are still carrying on. So far nationally we have settled down to where there is a minimum of distress resulting from the shortage of fuel. That is the short-range part of the problem they are trying to cope with.

The long-range part of the problem is involved in the accumulation of and analysis of data concerning energy. The big problem that we face so far is that there is a great deal of disagreement and lack of faith throughout the country with regard to what the real figures on energy are. We need a source of factual information which everybody can rely on, can trust and believe in, before we can begin to make the long-range policies that we need in order to solve our Nation's energy needs. That means we need to know what oil reserves we have and what drilling we need to carry on to meet the long-range needs of the country in the future and what we need to meet our needs today. We need to know more about the sources of foreign energy and what we can get from oil shale, coal, natural gas, and atomic energy and other sources. Hopefully, this agency in a very short time will have a new bank of reliable statistics of all sorts so anyone interested in the policy of energy will have some facts and figures they can rely on.

Mr. Chairman, I think everybody is aware that this whole energy problem has grown to the point where this type of energy expertise is needed. So, Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of this item as being a very necessary and important part of the whole energy agency bill.

Mr. GUNTER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEED. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the printing of some 4.8 billion gas rationing coupons by the Federal Energy Office, at a cost of better than $12 million, without specific authorization by the Committee on Appropriations. I would like to ask the gentleman if the item under chapter 6 in this bill provides for retroactive payment for that expenditure authorized by Mr. Simon of the FEO?

Mr. STEED. No. There is no reimbursement for the gas rationing stamps in this bill. The stamps were printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing out of their revolving fund, and they are still maintained in their possession.

If at some time in the future the stamps are drawn down and used, then that fund will be reimbursed. Or if a decision is made at some time in the future to dispose of the stamps, then a decision will have to be made as to what restoration to the revolving fund is going to be made.

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield still further, as I understand the explanation given by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) the expenditure for the gas rationing stamps which were not authorized specifically by the gentleman's committee, was made with funds from the revolving fund by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and would not come within the general transfer authority under chapter 6 of this bill.

Mr. STEED. That is right, because, you see, there would be no reimbursement involved until and unless an agency of the Government drew out of the warehouse

of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing any product that was made such as bonds, stamps, currency, whatever it is. These are still in storage by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. GUNTER. I wonder under what authority the Bureau of Engraving and Printing accepted the contract and expended the $12 million for printing these gas rationing coupons if the Committee on Appropriations did not give that authority.

Mr. STEED. Under the same authority that they would do work for any agency of the Government authorized by law. That is what the revolving fund is for.

Of course, this was an emergency situation where they had to have some leadtime. So they went ahead and printed them under their basic revolving fund authority.

Mr. GUNTER. If the gentleman will yield still further, of course, the thing that is of concern to me is the fact that even after the administration knew the Arab oil embargo was to be lifted, and even after the President announced that we would not have gasoline rationing, the printing of these gas ration coupons continued on and on in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I am wondering if the gentleman's subcommittee, or the full Committee on Appropriations, was able to review that situation. It seems to me that it is a terrible example of inefficiency in Government and a waste of taxpayers' dollars. I understand the gas ration coupons are now being stored in Government warehouses under armed guard, again at considerable taxpayers' expense.

Mr. STEED. We went into the matter with the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. But there are those in the House who think that we are not out of the woods yet on this energy problem; that we are merely having a temporary respite, and that there could well be a change by next year, and we would need the stamps. As of now it is just a piece of insurance that they want to hang onto them.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think I can respond to the gentleman from Florida on this matter. The Interior Appropriation Subcommittee held supplementary hearings with the Federal Energy Office on this matter, and discovered in those hearings that the rationing stamps were printed. I would suggest that the Members read the hearings because quite a detailed statement is contained in the hearing record.

The Senate committee made it very plain that the United States should be in a position to move instantly if the need arose, and the Members of the House Committee felt that this was the correct approach. The committee, for further verification, asked the Department of the Interior to send to us, what they considered a justification and authorization for the expenditure of these funds, and that document is on file with the committee. Therefore, the committee felt that it had no alternative but to pay the bill, and the House subsequently voted for inclusion of these funds. The House report on the second fiscal year 1974 supplemental bill sets forth very completely the cost of printing the coupons, and it is a little above $13.7 million.

These rationing coupons are ready and available should be the crisis arise again. May I say to the gentleman from Florida that if the United States continues to use energy at the present rate, with people driving 70 miles an hour, will probably have to use them.

I would again emphasize to the gentleman from Florida that the committee thoroughly investigated this whole matter. We did not particularly enjoy appropriating funds for this purpose but, on the other hand, had we not been in a position to have rationing coupons available if necessary then I think the Congress would have been criticized as much as the administration has been.

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield still further, so that I may add a comment, I did take note of a letter which I believe is a part of the committee files the gentlewoman from Washington has referred to, from General Counsel William Walker of the Federal Energy Office.

As I read that letter, there is indication that the contract was signed prior to the first supplemental appropriation which became law January 3 of this year. I am concerned that the FEO took action prior to the approval of the gentlewoman's subcommittee, and of the Congress and I am vitally concerned that we reviewed such a situation after the fact.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I remind the gentleman that during the House hearings on the first fiscal year 1974 Supplemental bill with the Office of Oil and Gas we asked Admiral Reich, the Administrator of the mandatory petroleum allocation program, if the budget was sufficient to take care of this emergency. This was late last fall, in November. He said, "Frankly, it is not."

We asked him to present to the committee a revised budget request that would provide adequate funds to take care of all contingencies. He submitted a revised request and indicated that he needed a minimum of $21.1 million to take care of all of the contingencies. In this first supplemental Congress did not say "No" to providing funds for printing of coupons, neither did it specifically approve. We did ask them to explain their reasoning for it and to provide the committee with the authorization on which it could be funded.

Mr. GUNTER. I did read the testimony on this matter thoroughly and it appeared to relate to personnel needs. Even in the letter from Mr. Walker there was not any mention made in his quotation of testimony with regard to the printing of gas rationing coupons.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There was no mention made to the committee on the printing of gas rationing coupons until after they had been printed. But as the gentleman well knows, the Members of Congress would have been the first ones to speak out if we had not had coupons ready for a rationing program if it became necessary.

I want to point out that another difficulty in printing these rationing coupons was the necessity for the highest type of security so that they could not be counterfeited. This was another part of the total problem. So, when it came to paying the bill, I certainly did not feel, and neither did the committee, that we should withhold these funds and drag our feet and have real problems sometime later.

Mr. GUNTER. Am I to understand the gentlewoman from Washington that her committee gave, if not specific, implied approval after the fact of the printing bill for these 4.8 billion gas rationing coupons?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that we did the things that would make sure that the gasoline distribution and the oil distribution in this country would be done as fairly and as swiftly and as expeditiously as possible. We had the problem of the economy. We had the problem of people out of work. We had major problems in this country and we set about solving them as expeditiously as possible. The Senate said it even more emphatically than we did, but the major thing we wanted was to be ready for all contingencies. We did not specifically approve printing of ration coupons. We did not specifically approve any single step.

Mr. STEED. Let me reassure the gentleman that there are no funds in this bill on the subject he is discussing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is there some reason why the Bureau of Printing and Engraving cannot crank up its presses and print the greenbacks necessary to pay for the printing of the coupons?

Mr. STEED. The problem of producing paper goods at the Bureau of Printing and Engraving requires some time and the size of this order of gasoline stamps has strained even their considerable capacity.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have been told in some detail of the importance of this bill and its implications for the future; so, for the sake of brevity, I will restrict my comments to two specific areas in the proposal which I find of particular importance. Both of these items, in situ oil shale processing and thermonuclear fusion, are research and development programs in the strictest sense of the term, because both hold a tantalizing promise for the future, yet neither can now provide the certainty that their promise will be delivered.

If there is any answer to the environmental dilemma that is shaping up over oil shale processing, it is the prospect that the in situ method will allow the

least disturbance and scarring of the ground in the oil shale areas of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming. As most of my colleagues understand, the in situ method does not require that raw oil shale be stripped or mined underground and then processed above ground. In contrast to above-ground processing, the in situ process takes place in an underground cavern. Air and hot gases are injected into the cavern at temperatures which will draw the hydrocarbons out of the shale within the cavern. In simplest terms—and if everything goes well—there should be a pool of oil at the bottom of the cavern which can be pumped out.

On the basis of test runs already completed by Occidental Oil, it appears that if the technology for this process is successfully developed, it could require less than half the capital costs of above-ground processing, and it may be able to produce oil at $1 to $2 per barrel less than the present world price. However, even more significant to those of us who serve on the Public Works-AEC Appropriations Subcommittee, and who must constantly concern ourselves with the water needs of the Western States, is the fact that the in situ process may require only a fraction of the water which will be necessary for above-ground processing of oil shale.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. I am happy to yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is addressing himself to a very important area of research, the in situ process through which oil may be made available. Yet I understand an amendment is to be offered to strike out funds for this important research. I hope the gentleman's position will prevail.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

As I started to say, according to a Department of the Interior study made last year, and supplemented within the last few weeks, there may be adequate amounts of surface water available to support a 1-million-barrel-per-day, aboveground oil shale industry in the West; however, a 3- to 5-million-barrel-per-day industry—required to make full use of this resource—could conceivably require every drop of water in the oil shale regions of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, leaving absolutely nothing for the other water needs of the area.

It is understandable then why we ought to encourage a vigorous research and development effort which seeks to prove the feasibility of the underground method; and, as you will see in the bill before us, the Atomic Energy Commission will share in some of the R. & D. work through the "applications of underground explosions" research program.

The AEC possesses a unique competence in underground rock fracturing as a result of its weapons testing program and the work it has performed on the Plowshare program, and we are wise to make full use of this expertise. However, as our colleague from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) explained to the House last week, the "applications of underground explosions" program, which is to do basic research on rock fracturing, is the frail stepchild of the incomplete—and in some respects unsatisfactory—Plowshare program. This being the case I would ask the gentleman from Wyoming, and the rest of my colleagues, to note carefully the language which appears on pages 28 and 29 of the report. our committee has attempted to move the AEC away from any present planning for the use of nuclear explosives in oil shale fracturing. We suggest on page 29 of the report that "greater emphasis be placed on underground chemical explosion research," and we do this because chemical explosives do offer important short-term prospects for tapping the energy potential of oil shale.

I personally believe that the public would be highly critical of the use of nuclear explosives for underground oil shale processing, and I fail to see the reasoning in moving toward research and development of nuclear explosives, when so much work remains to be done with chemical explosives. We are still at such a basic stage in this technology that effective research can be conducted with chemical explosives, and with a much more immediate payoff than the lengthy program which will be necessary to refine the art of nuclear explosives for this purpose, and I think we ought to move forward with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss for a moment the efficacy of the Occidental method. I was on a trip out there with the subcommittee. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the in situ method that has been developed is actually working?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. I cannot say it is actually working in anything other than a theoretical sense and, as the gentleman is suggesting, a good deal of work needs to be done before the Occidental method is economically feasible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure the gentleman is aware that other companies have made commitments of hundreds of millions of dollars in other methods of developing oil shale.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. I think that is true, but I should think the gentleman would want to go forward with the underground method if it can be made to work, because it does involve the least scarring and disturbance to the environment of the great States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, if the gentleman will yield further, that is true, especially what the gentleman is saying about the water requirements. Is the gentleman aware that there are 25 million acres of salt water underlying this process?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. The gentleman from New York is fully aware that there are plenty of problems with this entire approach; however, I think it is feasible to have included here a small amount of money, relatively speaking, for the AEC to conduct research into the underground fracturing method through the use of chemical explosives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point of the whole delegation from Wyoming and the delegation from Colorado is not to stop this work. I was in favor of the Plowshare program but it was the understanding of the State of Colorado there would be no further planning, at least that is the understanding most of the citizens got, there would be no further planning or no further appropriation until we had final evaluation of Rio Blanco.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That there would be no further testing or planning until we got a response back from the Rio Blanco shots. We want to be realistic about something that involves hundreds or thousands of nuclear blasts in our State. We want to have the response of the Rio Blanco shots.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Let me say to the gentleman, and others can correct me if I am wrong, that there are no funds included in this bill for nuclear explosions underground.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is no question about that, but this is what we understand the $107 million of the program is for, to develop that.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Well, subject of course to future appropriations.

Continuing, Mr. Chairman, there is another item I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues—for the second time in recent days—because I believe it important that this body be fully aware of the decisions which may soon be facing it. We have increased the appropriation for the fusion research program by almost $77 million over last year's appropriation; however, the total proposed appropriation for fusion research and development, $177.6 million, ought to be placed in some perspective with the $473.4 million total which is proposed for the liquid metal fastbreeder program.

During our debate, last week, on the AEC authorization bill, my colleagues may remember I urged even greater emphasis on the fusion R. & D. program, because it is so important to future energy resource planning that we know whether fusion will or will not work.

The House, in its wisdom, chose to accept the recommendation made by our Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, I do hope my amendment last week served notice that, sooner or later,

Congress must make some far-reaching decisions on the course of our long-term energy research program. As the report on the special energy bill makes clear, we are placing a good deal of our money and our reliance on the prospects of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor. I would urge my colleagues to pay very close attention to this program in coming years, because I believe I detect some serious problems with it at this early stage.

It is now apparent that the fast breeder is going to be far more costly to develop than we ever imagined. The cost of construction of the Fast Flux Test Facility, which is a predemonstration breeder reactor of sorts, may be in the vicinity of $600 million when it is finally ready to operate. Yet when we first authorized this project in fiscal year 1967, we were given a total cost estimate of $87,500,000.

The figures here speak for themselves, but they are only part of the package. The actual demonstration breeder reactor, Demo No. 1, is yet to be built. In fiscal year 1967, we were talking about a $200 million demonstration reactor project. At this year's hearings of the AEC Appropriations Subcommittee, AEC representatives indicated that the price could go as high as a billion dollars; and I have good reason to believe that the final price will be in the vicinity of $1.5 billion.

Perhaps I should emphasize, here, that the fast breeder is a research project, and no one can contest that we always expected there would be unforeseen problems and, therefore, added costs. Yet, from our perspective today, we had better ask two things of the breeder reactor program. How much will it finally cost? And, what will we get for that price?

We have asked in our report on the special energy appropriations that a detailed breakdown of total planned costs for the breeder demonstration program be submitted to our committee prior to next year's action on the fiscal year 1976 appropriation for the program. So that, by next year at this time, my colleagues should have the answer to my first question, and a much more precise idea of what they are going to have to pay for the breeder.

Second, what are we going to get? As best I can determine, we are going to get a working breeder reactor, which will breed enough fuel for another, similar reactor in 60 years time. This so-called doubling time of 60 years does not meet the objective we have foreseen for the breeder, since its theoretical promise is that it will breed enough fuel to meet the growing energy demands of the 21st century. For purposes of this program, we have been operating on the assumption that when the breeder is put to full commercial use, energy demand will be doubling about every 10 years. Even if this projection proves largely inaccurate, it will still take one or more additional demonstration breeder reactors to increase the fuel-producing properties of the reactor and, as my colleagues may have noted, the bill before us proposes a $2 million appropriation for the first stages of work on a second demonstration breeder reactor.

Added costs, time delays, and the need to build another generation of demonstration breeder reactors suggest the possible dilemma that the breeder demonstration program might overlap the demonstration of other energy alternatives which are now on the planning boards. It is conceivable, for instance, that the scientific feasibility of the fusion reactor may be demonstrated before the end of this decade, and that a demonstration fusion reactor may be successful at the end of the next decade. There are similar prospects for the generation of electricity through solar power, as well as geothermal processes now under study.

I do not suggest that we can afford to rely on such prospects, but it will be the responsibility of the Congress to carefully weigh the progress of alternative energy R. & D. programs during the next few years, and to be prepared to revise research priorities when the test results suggest such revision. This is particularly true of the thermonuclear fusion program, which could possibly provide a vast energy resource, using cheap, easily accessible fuel.

The basic fusion fuels are effectively in infinite supply, since they are derivatives of hydrogen which can be extracted from water at negligible cost, and with no negative environmental impact. Second, a successful fusion reactor would be much safer than a breeder reactor, because there will be no emergency core cooling problems in fusion systems, and there are no weapons grade nuclear materials involved. And, it now appears that radioactivity associated with the fusion reactor can be kept at very low levels, possibly less than one-thousandth of the radioactive levels resulting from the breeder reactor.

Each of the alternatives to the breeder I have mentioned—fusion, solar power, and geothermal power—has the critical shortcoming that scientific and commercial feasibility have not been established. Yet, none of them has the enormous shortcoming of the breeder reactor, which will leave to future generations plutonium wastes with a half-life of 24,000 years. By carrying the breeder to full commercial deployment we are not only signing up for an enormously costly research and development program which may not complete its work until the 1990's, we are also consenting to the production of considerable volumes of lethal waste materials which must be cared for by hundreds of future generations.

The demands of the present dictate that we continue our Faustian bargain with the future by completing technological development of the fast breeder reactor. Its feasibility is beyond question, and it is the only present alternative which will add to the nuclear fuel stockpile, rather than further depleting diminishing uranium reserves. We should not, however, commit ourselves to total reliance on the breeder.

Other alternatives are in the offing, and they must be encouraged as our funding and manpower resources will allow. Many of my colleagues here today will participate in determining what energy resources will be available to the next generation, and what price that generation will have to pay. I emphatically appeal to those of you who will make these decisions to keep your research and development options as open as this country's resources will allow.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a most unusual bill and a most unusual procedure. I have no doubt that this legislation will go winging out of the House with few negative votes, because it states a popular position on a popular subject.

This bill says to Americans: "Your Congress is solving the energy shortage by taking bold steps to establish all manner of good research and development projects at high levels of funding." Every Member knows that Americans want aggressive programs to move us to a position of independence and sufficiency in energy.

The Congress has been accused of neglect in energy development and of failing to act on meaningful legislation, but this bill claims "not guilty" on both accounts. This bill implies that the Congress is moving with care, forethought and wisdom to channel national resources to meet a pressing need.

But what do we really have here? This is a special energy development appropriation put together in haste with little consideration other than a quick look by the committee. It lacks the careful craftsmanship typical of the Appropriations Committee, and it comes to the floor of the House without adequate subcommittee hearings or staff work to establish appropriate levels of funding.

Even further, flying in the face of long defended tradition, this appropriation certains many programs which are not yet authorized. Under the rule, these cannot be attacked.

This is an appropriation—not an authorization. Sometimes we posture and overpromise with authorizing legislation, but we generally do not handle taxpayers' dollars with such disdain. When one looks at the economy and the health of the dollar, appropriations such as this are astounding. Since 1965 we have undercut the purchasing power of the dollar with deficit spending, and this bill will continue to feed the fires of inflation. As proposed, expenditures will exceed the budget by $66,100,000 with a total appropriation of $2,269,000,000 of hard-earned taxpayers' dollars and little more than hope and trust that it will be spent wisely. Over all, this is a $923,404,000 income over the budget for these items this year.

This bill is a hit-and-miss proposition. Every line item that could be labeled "energy" was pulled into this appropriation, regardless of its subcommittee assignment. There is duplication and overlapping among many items. Such spending measures as this could only be contrived in a "political" year when the majority party is eagerly trying to avoid being dubbed a "do-nothing" party Congress.

In December 1973, the House passed and sent to the Senate a bill to consolidate the energy-related functions of various Federal agencies, including many of the agencies mentioned in this appropriation bill. This approach would certainly provide a more effective method to coordinate research and development programs and to avoid costly overlap and duplication. However, this bill has been bottled up on the other side of Capitol Hill.

Knowing that some leaders in the other body believed the energy reorganization bill to be too weak, I proposed H.R. 12265, to establish an Energy Research and Development Administration. This is a stronger bill with the stated goal of making the United States self-sufficient in energy resources by 1980. However, this bill, too, is languishing in committee.

The congressional approach to solving the energy problems, as illustrated by this appropriations bill, can be compared to the man who mounted a horse and rode off in all directions. Until the Congress develops a single administrative body to oversee the energy research and development programs, we will continue to have unsuccessful, uncoordinated, costly, and wasteful programs. Whenever a single administrative agency becomes a reality, the committee structure of the House can be realigned so that one committee has oversight of energy related legislation and one subcommittee of appropriations can handle the funding. Until that decisive step is taken, the cross-jurisdictions of the executive department will continue to siphon taxpayers' dollars into a bottomless pit.

Finally, let me add that this energy appropriation bill appears to me to be in direct conflict with the spirit of the budget reform measure (H.R. 7130) passed by the House last year. Members of this body have complained bitterly because the executive branch through OMB has usurped budgetmaking powers of Government, but it is irresponsible action such as this that forced the administration to ride herd on congressional appropriations.

It seems to be an ingrained philosophy with many of my colleagues to solve a problem by throwing money at it, but a responsible Congress will require assurance that dollars invested in research and development programs are used wisely. Until the mechanism to safeguard the administration of these funds is established the Congress is shirking its duty.

As I said in the beginning of these remarks, this bill will go winging through the House today with few negative votes, but it is a sad monument, indeed, to the cosmetic decision by the leadership.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. MAHON, and to express my appreciation for what I believe is an excellent format on presenting the appropriations for the various energy oriented agencies in one bill. This was subject to some criticism, but I believe that it does expedite the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a German opera out of this—or as some people might say, an Italian opera—about my proposition to strike $4 million from the appropriation. I will speak further on that when my amendment comes before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, we have the assurance from the chairman of the committee that Wyoming's Plowshare program wagon wheel is dead as a doornail. We have the assurances of my good friend, the competent chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, that there are not funds here for nuclear detonations.

I do, however, join with the entire Colorado delegation in hoping that the Atomic Energy Commission will be kept to its word and fulfill the instruction from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which was to assess and evaluate objectively and truthfully the results of the Rio Blanco shot before any further funds are to be expended for nuclear detonations in gas fields in Plowshare work.

On page 60 of the report on the authorization last week—

> Plowshare's work is restricted to development of explosive devices capable of sequential firing in spite of exposure to nuclear shocks, and AEC Chairman Dixy Lee Ray has stated that the next test event, Wagon Wheel, which is to involve for the first time sequential detonations of five 100 kiloton explosives and which is planned for the Green River Basin in Wyoming, is in truth "dead as a doornail."

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in spite of it being dead as a doornail, in Wyoming, we see that there is $179 million earmarked for the next 10 years for nuclear detonations, including $56 million for demonstration field experiments in Colorado, with five to six wells with three to five explosions per well.

I listened to the Colorado deal, since they are planned for Colorado, rather sympathetically, and I say the monkey is off my back. I am not carrying the load any more on efforts to keep the Atomic Energy Commission to its word. I submit that for Members who wish to get to the end of this matter, it will be too late, after a couple of hundred detonations underground have occurred, to decide to do so. We will be irrevocably committed.

In the RECORD for April 24, 1974—and if the Members ever read anything of importance in their lives, this will be it—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 11761, on the subject of radiation doses from Plowshare gas, there is an article on potential radiation doses from Plowshare gas done by C. J. Barton of the Oak Ridge Laboratories. I urge the Members to read what he has to say about this matter. Probably we can live with usage of this gas if it is diluted with massive ratios of nonnuclear produced gas.

It is in any event a true record for those who want to know the facts about use of Plowshare gas. Some risk is clearly pointed out. The continuation of nuclear detonations on the shale oil fields jeopardizes recovery of this resource. We will have waste in both resources, uranium feed stock and the gas or shale being sought. We now have five glazed big chimneys underground, containing massive concentrations of natural gas, all unusable, contaminated gas.

Mr. Chairman, there has not been one single cubic foot of gas usable or proven usable, and a good many scientists agree to that. There is not one penny in this appropriation of $3.6 billion, not one penny of this amount that will go to clean one cubic foot of that natural gas or to decontaminate it. All we are doing is continuing to flare it and to waste it, and spend money for more explosions to create more caverns of unusable gas.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members will move forward on the issue of the appropriation. It is a simple enough step to delete $4 million from the funds to be spent by the Atomic Energy Commission until there is an assessment of Rio Blanco.

Mr. Chairman, once the assessment is in, and if the decision is that we can live with radiated natural gas, I have no objection to the program going ahead. I am not fearful of the program. I merely want the Atomic Energy Commission to complete what they promised.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman from Michigan will regret yielding me unlimited time. Nevertheless, I thank him.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this bill calls for the appropriation of $2,269,828,000, which exceeds the budget by $66,100,000.

I will ask my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if I have addressed myself to the proper figures.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, the gentleman is correct that the bill does contain an appriation of $2.2-plus billion for special energy research, which is about 70 percent more than we provided for this purpose last year. And this increase is for the purpose of accelerating the ways and means to meet the energy shortage, not tomorrow, not the day after tomorrow, but 10 years or more from now. Some of the money in this bill will hopefully bear some fruit long before that.

Mr. GROSS. In passing I should like to make an observation concerning the unbelievable interest in this bill. Beyond the members of the Committee on Appriations, and those associated with it, I doubt that there have been more than 20 others Members on the House floor this afternoon on this $2.2 billion issue. There has been much talk and professed concern about energy but there is little demonstration of interest here today.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is in

effect a compliment to the committee which brings out this bill and the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations that people have such great confidence in our judgment and in our effort here that they have felt it best to leave the matter in our hands. So that, I think, is the chief explanation. Of course, there is another reason here.

Mr. GROSS. There must be another reason.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a further reason is that this bill deals with atomic energy; it deals with solar energy; it deals with geothermal energy, with coal and many other new sources of energy. It does not deal specifically with petroleum in a major way. And that is what the fighting has been about in the consideration of some of the other energy bills.

Mr. Chairman, of course, there have been efforts to overregulate the petroleum industry in this country, and there have been efforts to roll back prices. Some punitive legislation has been proposed.

Many of these efforts which have been suggested would, in my opinion, tend to produce less rather than more energy. Certainly there can be no doubt but that this bill is a move in the right direction and in a less controversial field.

I believe this is a landmark bill. I believe we will look back on it with pride. Despite the lack of enormous interest everybody will vote for it.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope, I will say to my distinguished friend from Texas, this would be the means of ascertaining what has really been going on with respect to the alleged petroleum shortage. It is hard for me to understand why there has been such an enormous increase, for instance, in the price of gasoline in the last few months. Why has there been such price increases when the domestic supply constitutes a tremendous amount of what we consume. I think the figures show that we import only about 1 percent. I can understand the increase in the cost of gasoline as it relates to petroleum imports from foreign countries, but I cannot understand the overall increase considering the 85 to 90 percent supply of domestically produced petroleum products. I hope that some committee of the Congress even at this late date would give us the facts and figures to which we are entitled. We have not been able to get them from the Federal Energy Office. Maybe $2.2 billion will produce some information. I doubt it.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning another item in the report.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman let me comment on that?

Mr. GROSS. I would never refuse the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the gentleman knows that we do import several million barrels of oil per day for U.S. consumption, approximately 6 million barrels a day or 17 percent of all energy consumed in the United States. The price of this imported petroleum has been greatly increased in this hemisphere, and in the Middle East; so prices have gone very high. There is an effort to secure more domestic production of oil, and the stripper wells—and there are thousands of them which produce 10 barrels or less of oil per day—are being encouraged by better prices ranging to $10 per barrel to produce more. Of course, it also costs more to produce from these wells.

Then there is an effort to stimulate additional production and more exploration and further drilling of wells. So it seems to me this is very important. If we are going to solve the energy problem and become more self-sufficient, we have to be willing to pay the price necessary to get our marginal wells working and get on with the additional task of creating more drilling rigs, producing more oil equipment, and so on, and pay the prices necessary to sustain this.

I think it is unfortunate that some of our friends in and out of the Government have gone too far overboard in blanket attacks on the oil industry. It has been alleged that there has been some price gouging and I certainly support efforts to obtain proper information that will assist Government officials in taking proper action.

However, I think if we can give sufficient latitude and flexibility to the oil industry, the ingenuity of American enterprise will be such that we will move toward almost total self-sufficiency in the field of petroleum and energy, and that is what we are seeking to do.

Mr. GROSS. I think that what many millions of Americans are interested in is whether there has been and whether there will continue to be gouging in prices relating to petroleum products. Up to this point we have had no reliable information on that subject. I hope that somewhere along the line, I say again, we can get some hard and fast information that we can rely upon as to the justification for what has already taken place.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. We must be able to get more and better information in regard to our energy program.

The Congress and the executive department are taking steps in that direction. I share in the gentleman's hope that we can get better and more trustworthy information to be of assistance to us in making our government policy.

Mr. GROSS. If we do not stop runaway inflation we will have some form of regimentation in this country, some form of a government takeover. In the opinion of the gentleman from Iowa, for whatever that may be worth, unless somebody stops the inflation that is chewing at the vitals of our economy, we are going to walk right into a crisis in this country.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, if we can stimulate production of fuel and energy sufficiently then the price situation will tend to take care of itself, and the same will be true with regard to other scarce items. That in my opinion will assist in the fight against inflation.

Mr. GROSS. I would now like to ask a question about an item on page 31 entitled "Underground and Other Electric Power Transmission Research," and the appropriation of $8.5 million for that purpose.

I would ask what is intended to be accomplished by the expenditure of that amount of money?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) is more familiar with that situation. The gentleman from Tennessee conducted the hearings, and I would like the gentleman to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the Office of the Secretary of the Interior testified in favor of a stronger budget for this purpose because of the feeling in this country concerning the transmission of power.

The people of the country would also like underground transmission of electricity which, of course, is going to require a great deal of research in order to be able to develop the technology. This is not only to convey energy underground, but also to improve the overhead transmission of electricity. There is a definite need to go forward with energy research in this area.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) do not those in the field of electrical transmission, the public utilities and private utilities, already know the efficiency of underground transmission of electricity as opposed to overhead transmission? Is this not a question of money necessary to bury transmission lines rather than research for that purpose?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. No. It is largely for research because through improved transmission of electricity we can conserve energy.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Because there has already been some research in this area.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought. Then why spend $8.5 million for such purpose?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Because we need to improve our transmission of electric power, so that we can save electricity. We can save a great portion of the electric power presently lost in transmission through more efficient means of transmission of that power.

Mr. GROSS. Sure we want to save electricity, but I will wager dollars to doughnuts—and the House floor is no place to be talking about wagering—that the electrical industry already knows the feasibility and differences between transmission lines underground and transmission lines above ground.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield further to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will read from the report where it says that:

Electric energy lost between generation and customer utilization varies between 5 and 15 percent of energy generated, for an average loss of about 10 percent. The Committee is informed that distribution efficiency improvements of 5 to 10 percent by the year 2000, assuming a continued 8 percent annual growth for electrical energy generation, could mean annual savings of 1 to 2 billion barrels of oil.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I still submit to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, that they already know all they need to know about burying electrical transmission lines underground, and that this is an $8.5 million expenditure that could very well be saved for the taxpayers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to try to help shed some light on this subject. Part of this research and development has to do with superconducting underground lines. This is a completely new type of transmission of electricity. If we can develop super conducting transmission, we might, for instance, be able to provide all of the electricity for the city of New York in two cables, 6 inches in diameter, buried in the utilities, but it is in the national interest just the same as any other research and development we are doing.

Quite obviously, any energy research and development, including nuclear energy, fusion, solar energy, geothermal, oil shale and others ultimately is going to be exploited by public or private utilities, but it is in the national interest to do the R. & D., and provide the relevant information. Today we do not have this technology ready for use, but it has great potential. It will save, as the chairman has said, a great deal of electricity. It will save a great deal of material, but it is a new technology, and must be developed.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask my friend, the gentleman from Washington, this question: research on this particular subject as provided in this bill would not be for the purpose of coming to Congress later and asking good old Uncle Sugar to pay the costs of burying the powerlines in this country; would it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know about that. All I know is that the research and development is needed.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not use this for that kind of springboard; would he?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not use it. I would not pretend to speak for the utilities companies in the future, as the gentleman recognizes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. McCORMACK) why we have heard very little about research concerning hydrogen as a replacement for fossil fuels.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield, the gentleman from Ohio must understand, first of all, that hydrogen is not a source of energy. We must create hydrogen before we can use it. That is, we must dissociate water.

Mr. MILLER. That is exactly what I am talking about—research to do this.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, the research to do this is being carried out by the National Science Foundation primarily, although there is some work going on in NASA and in the AEC. The programs are still fairly embryonic, and are not ready for commercialization. There is much to be done to determine whether or not the use of hydrogen will be economically competitive. This requires long-range research. I believe it will become a much more important and significant part of our research and development program in the years to come.

Mr. MILLER. But my question is, What do we have in this bill that would allow us to do the research that will tend to give us the hydrogen that is necessary?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield again, this is in the National Science Foundation budget, and in NASA and the AEC.

Mr. MILLER. What amount is in this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that question; I am sorry.

Mr. MILLER. Apparently, then we have no money in the bill for basic research and, therefore, we would have no money in the bill in order to do research for the use of hydrogen as a fuel.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield again?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is money in the National Science Foundation for this purpose, but because I cannot quote the exact amount does not mean that research and development for the use of hydrogen is not adequately funded for the present time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am extremely disappointed to find less than 30 of my colleagues here on the House floor as this crucial appropriations bill is being discussed. This bill contains $2.27 billion in funds for energy research and development activities. Mr. MAHON, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in recognition of our current energy problems, has assembled these energy appropriations into a single bill. It is indeed sad to see so few of my colleagues present for this debate. It was only a few short months ago that almost every Member was eager to be involved in finding a solution to the energy crisis. Now it seems that with the fading of the gasoline lines their interest has also passed from the scene.

Under Project Independence President Nixon has set 1980 as the target date for the United States to achieve self-sufficiency in its energy needs. The funds that are provided in this bill will help us take the first step down that difficult path, but without the cooperation and active participation of each Member of Congress the goal will be difficult to achieve. The energy efforts supported by this appropriation provide several avenues of approach to the energy problem. Among these research approaches are a commercial demonstration of chemical coal cleaning technology; energy research and development projects in solar power, heating, and cooling; engine and aerodynamic research for ground transportation; and expanded research activities into coal gasification and liquefaction. An equally important part of these appropriations is the $19 million for Federal Energy Office salaries and expenses. These funds are needed to insure retention of a fully competent and professional staff in this important office.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in the atomic energy bill there is a considerable amount of research provided here for using the hydrogen nuclei as a basis for developing tremendous sources of energy. The gentleman from Tennessee mentioned that in his remarks. It is looked upon, while we are not in any practical stage as yet, as a possibility for unlimited supply of power if we can develop the technique for using it, an unlimited supply as widespread as the seven seas themselves. So I think there is a tremendous potential referred to in this, but we are not talking in terms of hydrogen as such. I think there is a little something in here on hydrogen storage, but that does not have the potential for overall energy development as the program I referred to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this $2.2 billion bill, which is more than $66 million above the budget, because it has duplication, waste and extravagance written all over it.

Moreover, the $8.5 million for research claimed to be necessary for putting transmission lines underground cannot, in my opinion, be justified. All of us want to solve the energy shortage but not on the terms and conditions of this legislation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support H.R. 14434, the special energy research and development bill, but as we discuss this crucially important subject there is one thing we ought to keep uppermost in our minds—the simple fact that the technology is now available to convert coal into liquid and gaseous fuel.

In saying that I do not wish to imply that there is no need for research, and no need for these funds, because the

opposite is actually true—as a matter of fact we need more coal research funds than the bill contains.

But I want to point out today—as I have in the past on the floor of the House—that right now in South Africa coal is being converted into liquid fuel, and it is being done on a commercially profitable scale.

This is nothing new in South Africa—they have had a process that is economically efficient for many years.

It is also nothing new to those of us who were in Europe during World War II, and saw the German war machine fueled through coal which had been converted into liquid fuel.

So I am glad that the funds for coal gasification and coal liquefaction research have been increased—both for the Bureau of Mines and the Office of Coal Research, but I must emphasize that what the Nation needs to solve the energy crisis permanently is an appropriation that would start construction of commercial scale plants to convert coal into liquid fuel and gas.

With the tremendous coal resources we have—in my area as well as other areas of the country—we will insure ample energy supplies at a feasible price once we commit ouselves to the extent necessary to build a real coal conversion industry.

We should start on that now, and at the same time we must begin the other efforts that will tie in with coal conversion—training the coal technicians and miners and engineers and chemists, building the coal cars and other vital elements in the transportation system for this new industry.

We must move this all together, and not let one element fall behind.

But I would like to point out that all this would not have been necessary if the administration and the Congress had used a little foresight more than 20 years ago. We were operating several demonstration plants then near St. Louis which were just pennies away from a process to convert coal into liquid fuel as cheaply as it was being done from petroleum.

The administration—at the behest of the oil industry—refused to budget a few million dollars to keep those plants going, and the Congress went along.

The plants were shut down—dismantled—and for years afterward we lagged behind in developing a coal conversion process that would have insured cheap and readily available fuel today.

Let us not let that happen ever again.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in conjunction with my support of this bill—which I consider a good bill—because it reflects the special focus and priority of attention that energy R. & D. must receive from the standpoint of the best interests of our Nation—I want to commend the distinguished chairman, GEORGE MAHON, and the Appropriations Committee, for the quality of their report accompanying the bill. Among other things, it depicts quite clearly the widespread and disjointed posture of our Federal energy R. & D. efforts. These efforts are scrambled among various executive agencies; and effective coordination of kindred efforts as well as elimination of unnecessary duplication cannot be assured under the present system.

Fortunately, this body passed several months ago a bill to create a new, independent executive agency—ERDA, the Energy Research and Development Administration. ERDA will be charged with the responsibility to provide central policy planning and management of R. & D. programs and projects involving all energy sources and energy utilization technologies. Many of the presently fragmented energy R. & D. activities funded by this $2.2 billion appropriation will forthwith be transferred to ERDA's jurisdiction; others will follow eventually. For the first time, and at long last, a central Federal R. & D. agency will give comprehensive and systematic direction to the long-range dimensions of our energy problem. A Senate version of the ERDA bill is before the full Committee on Government Operations in the Senate. Early favorable action by the committee and the Senate is expected.

The appropriations bill now before us will complement the ERDA approach. I applaud these vigorous and timely actions by the House to meet the great energy R. & D. challenge that faces us.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee concerning chapter VI of the bill, related to the Federal Energy Office, and the explanatory remarks on page 36 of the committee's report accompanying the bill.

I note there is no indication that the Federal Energy Office, which was established and is functioning pursuant to an Executive order, will soon be superseded by a statutorily created agency called the Federal Energy Agency FEA. FEA's authority, responsibilities, and functions will be those provided for by the FEA bill and other statutes, not by the Executive order establishing FEO. The FEA bill recently emerged from Senate-House conference, and yesterday, this body approved the resultant measure by a vote of 356 to 9; favorable Senate action is expected very soon.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the committee has—and this is not a criticism of the committee at all, but this is done for the purpose of establishing legislative history—in the FEA bill on page 10 of the conference report, there is the following section of the bill:

Sec. 9. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is authorized and directed to make such additional incidental dispositions of personnel, personnel positions, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds held, used, arising from, available to, or to be made available in connection with, functions which are transferred by or which revert under this Act, as the Director deems necessary and appropriate to accomplish the intent and purpose of this Act.

It was the intent of our committee that the function of the Federal Energy Office would be superseded by the Federal Energy Agency.

My question is this: Is it not intended that, notwithstanding any of the explanatory remarks in the accompanying report from the Committee on Appropriations, FEA's authority, responsibilities and functions—when the FEA bill becomes law — will only be as authorized by such statute and other laws, excluding this appropriation bill?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The gentleman will remember that first it was the Energy Council, which became the Federal Energy Office, and it was with that title that we were dealing when we wrote this bill.

As the gentleman points out, the Federal Energy Agency bill now has cleared the House and presumably it will become law. The gentleman from California, the chairman, very thoughtfully placed in the energy bill the transfer language that we need to clear up the matter he is talking about.

We have discussed this point with legal counsel at the Federal Energy Office, and they say the language in the gentleman's bill is all the authority they need and there will be absolutely no difficulty at all. The transition will be a routine matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his reply.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will count. 42 Members are present, not a quorum.

The call will be taken by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 192]

Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Patman
Bafalis	Fraser	Pettis
Blatnik	Giaimo	Pickle
Breaux	Gray	Powell, Ohio
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Railsback
Carey, N.Y.	Haley	Reid
Chisholm	Hanna	Roberts
Clark	Hébert	Rodino
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Roncallo, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
de la Garza	Mezvinsky	Rose
Devine	Milford	Sisk
Diggs	Murphy, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.
Dingell	Myers	Stokes
Dorn	O'Neill	Stubblefield
Drinan	Owens	Wilson,
Dulski	Parris	Charles H.,
Esch	Passman	Calif.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. HAMILTON), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14434, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by

electronic device, whereupon 381 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), and the chairmen of the subcommittees, as well as the ranking minority members, for this consolidated energy appropriations bill.

For several years I have been expressing the need for a systems approach to an integrated national energy policy, and this appropriations bill is a step in that direction. If we can develop a national energy policy and the programs to carry it into effect to integrate the use of all fuels and all sources of energy; nuclear energy research, and development demonstration, including nuclear fusion; our solar and geothermal energy research; our coal research, including new techniques for coal mining and coal liquefaction and gasification; for new oil and gas exploration and exploitation; for secondary and tertiary recovery of gas and oil; for oil shale development; for programs for transmission and storage of energy; for conservation and environmental protection in every step of everything we do.

If we can include fuels requirements and water requirements and capitalization requirements, with the huge cost in dollars that these programs will require, if we can include the technical manpower requirements, the logistics and transportation, the essential materials such as steel and copper, and other critical materials, and how each of these relate to the other, and how each of these demands relates to the other for this year and next and for 1980 and 1985 and 1990—if we can develop such a systems approach to a national energy policy, then we will have an opportunity to solve the energy crisis.

But I want to emphasize that if we do not develop such a systems approach to an integrated national energy policy, the result will inevitably be catastrophe.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee. This action today is a significant step forward for our Nation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have had an interesting and worthwhile debate in regard to the pending $2.2 billion appropriation bill. The purpose of this appropriation bill is to expedite the development of new sources of energy, sources of energy that are not now available to us. I anticipate that as a result of the additional thrust represented by this bill within 10 years or so something dramatic will be achieved by way of production of energy from additional sources.

While the bill today speaks well for the long-range future, it means very little for the immediate situation with respect to our energy requirements. In the closing of the debate on this bill I would like to point out to the House that the short-range solution to the energy crisis does not lie with this bill but lies with a policy of certainty and stability with respect to the traditional means of producing oil and gas in this country.

The greatest threat, Mr. Chairman, to the solution of our immediate energy problem is not lack of supplies or lack of know-how. The greatest threat to the solution of our energy problem is uncertainty. The Congress and the executive branch must hasten to make basic decisions that will provide certainty and stability. Until the producers of energy—until these free enterprise people know what the rules of the game are and know what they can count on tax-wise and otherwise and know that the climate will be stable, they cannot move forward with any degree of confidence.

There must be stability. Today there is not stability.

About 75 percent or 80 percent of all the gas and oil wells are drilled by independent oil men, many of whom must seek financial support in their efforts. They have to know that if they strike oil and gas they at least have an opportunity to make a profit and liquidate their debts.

I felt it appropriate to point out this at this time.

When we go back into the House I shall obtain permission to revise and extend my remarks and insert into the RECORD certain materials which I think will be of significance, but I thought it well as we debate this bill today that we grapple in our minds with the major problem of moving as rapidly as possible toward stability in the energy industry so that our private enterprise system can operate effectively.

Mr. Chairman, through nearly all our Nation's history we have been blessed with an abundance of cheap and secure energy. This is one of the vital factors that allowed our Nation to grow and prosper.

That situation has now changed. Since 1958 the United States has been a net importer of energy. Today, we face difficulties in obtaining enough energy and no longer is it either cheap or secure.

The reason for this is a straightforward one. Since 1950 energy consumption increased about 3.5 percent per year and since 1970 at 4.5 percent per year while domestic energy production increased only 3 percent from 1950 to 1970 and after 1970 virtually came to a halt.

This gap between supply and demand was filled principally by imports of foreign oil, with the big increases coming from the politically volatile Middle East.

By 1973, the United States was receiving 17 percent of its total energy supply, or 6 million barrels of oil per day, from the Middle East.

I would now like to quote directly from the committee report.:

The Arab oil embargo caused, almost overnight, a national consensus which called for energy independence as soon as possible. That consensus remains today although probably not with the same degree of intensity, now that gasoline is more easily available.

If U.S. energy growth continued at its pre-oil embargo rate and domestic production did not significantly change, it is estimated that by 1980 the U.S. would be required to import 19 million barrels of oil per day and the equivalent of 2 million barrels per day of natural gas in liquified form.

Clearly such dependence is unacceptable. We could never be assured of a consistent supply, and the payment for this oil would be extraordinarily high. Estimates of our foreign oil payment in 1980 under these circumstances range from $35 to $45 billion per year.

All of these factors now make U.S. energy independence a national goal of the highest urgency and priority.

The Committee on Appropriations believes that the funds in this bill for energy research and development will greatly assist the Nation in moving toward its long-term goal of energy independence.

However, and again I quote from the report:

Much of the research and development which this bill provides, as absolutely essential as it is, will not have productive, useable results on a significant scale for 10 years or more. Thus, an energy problem and a need for foreign imports will continue to exist for many years to come.

In the short run—between now and the mid-1980's—it will be essential that the American people continue and even expand their energy conservation practices.

Additionally, it is essential that more oil and gas be discovered and produced as rapidly as possible in the United States and that coal be used wherever reasonably possible and acceptable. The immediate need is to use less energy and to set about providing more.

Although the U.S. faces difficult energy problems in the years ahead, the Committee is confident that in the long run this nation will solve its energy problems.

Fortunately, sizeable reserves of oil and gas still exist in the U.S. along with huge reserves of coal and oil shale. Immediately increased production of oil and gas is crucial. In fact this, along with disciplined conservation practices offers the only hope for short term solutions to the energy problem.

The Federal Government is in a unique position of responsibility with respect to the future availability of energy to sustain the growth and strengthen the economy of our nation. Public lands account for about 36 percent of the nation's petroleum resources, 43 percent of the natural gas, 50 percent of the coal, 40 percent of the uranium, 60 percent of the geothermal, and 85 percent of the oil shale reserves. These resources constitute a national trust of massive proportions.

From a resources standpoint—both those in private hands and on public lands—we are in an excellent position relative to the other developed nations of the world. Furthermore, the scientific and managerial capabilities within the business, academic, and governmental sectors of our society are enormous. If we as a nation are to meet the challenges of the energy crisis, this potential must be marshalled, organized, and oriented in a skillful, dedicated manner. The role of the Federal Government in our energy future is crucial. This bill will contribute to

the effort by providing adequate funding for the Federal energy research and development programs for the coming fiscal year in a timely manner.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to state some personal views of what must be done in order to have a successful energy policy for this Nation.

First, we must have a stable economic climate in terms of taxes, prices, and regulatory policy. Oil and gas producers must be allowed sufficient profits to increase exploration, production, refining, distribution, and marketing, to meet consumer needs. We must stop this foolish talk of rolling back by law crude oil prices so that the oil industry can proceed with confidence toward making the necessary efforts, through massive investments and otherwise, to meet the Nation's energy needs.

Second, we must deregulate the wellhead price of natural gas. Many are aware of the disastrous consequences that Federal price regulation has had on natural gas exploration and discovery and the energy problem generally.

Probably quicker than any other single action, this could produce substantial additional energy.

Third, we all must increase our efforts to conserve. The wasteful energy habits that we have all allowed ourselves to drift into must be turned around. An energy conservation ethic must become a part of our lives.

Fourth, we must greatly increase our search for new oil and gas reserves in this country. Independent oil and gas producers represent the only realistic hope this country has of rapidly expanding our domestic production of energy. I say this because about 75 percent of all exploratory wells are drilled by the independents. And, of course, the independent producer cannot provide the capital and proceed effectively unless he has a reasonable expectation of a fair return on his investment.

Fifth, we must develop policies that will permit the construction of domestic refineries and support facilities.

And sixth, we must of course pursue the development of other forms of energy, such as nuclear fusion, coal gasification and liquefaction, and geothermal and solar and wind power, such as this bill provides.

In this energy research appropriation bill before us today we are looking far down the road toward the development of new methods for energy production. The measure before us, I say again, provides no immediate relief. It is only through a massive effort to increase production of gas and petroleum, by more or less traditional methods, that we have any hope of meeting the intermediate range problem.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this legislation represents a major step forward by Congress. If the administration continues to be unwilling or incapable of providing the leadership and direction for a comprehensive national energy policy, then this body must marshal its forces as best it knows how, and that is through the appropriations process.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for combining energy research and development activities into one legislative measure. Not only does this indicate to the Nation the high priority in Congress for energy R. & D., but it also allows us to deliberate our energy spending with a total overview.

The citizens of this Nation fully support energy research and development. Over 77 percent of the constituents of the First Congressional District of Oklahoma recommended in my most recent questionnaire, that Congress spend additional funds for energy R. & D.

It did not take long for Americans to fully understand the impact of an energy shortage to our economy. Layoffs and plant shutdowns increased, and the decreased supply caused higher prices which added significantly to our uncontrolled inflation.

I fully support the entire range of R. & D. efforts also outlined in this legislation, including atomic energy and renewable resources such as solar and geothermal energy. But as the committee so accurately indicated in its report, one of the few actions we can take which would significantly increase our energy supplies in the short term is to develop the capability to recover oil and natural gas already located but unproducible by methods now in use.

My particular interest in oil and gas research is due to the fact that the First Congressional District of Oklahoma contains a unique concentration of oil and gas research facilities and technical talent which is already hard at work on these problems. The money to be appropriated to the Bureau of Mines for oil and gas research will be among our most intelligent investments.

The BOM expects that such research can add 100 million barrels of oil and 1 trillion cubic feet of gas annually by 1980. In the perspective of our recent energy shortfall of approximately 2 million barrels a day and with a maximum of 2 million barrels a day to be provided by the trans-Alaska pipeline, this is a target well worth our most diligent efforts.

We must always keep in mind that oil and natural gas are nonrenewable and precious resources. Of the approximately 425 billion barrels of crude oil discovered in the United States, 290 million barrels remain in the ground after conventional recovery methods have been applied. In the interest of conserving these precious resources, we must not let short-range economic consideration and out-dated methods cause producers to "kill the well" or "pull the pipe," and leave over two-thirds of this oil in place.

This oil and gas research is the foundation for our future self-sufficiency. The recovery of oil from operating fields averages only 30 percent of the oil in place, and is only some 40 percent in the newest fields. Every 1 percent increase in recovery rates adds 4 billion barrels to proven U.S. reserves.

Earlier this year I had the opportunity to visit several of the major oil and gas research facilities in the Tulsa area, including the Bureau of Mines Energy Research Center in Bartlesville and private industry facilities. I was extremely impressed by the sophistication of the work now underway, both in the public and private sector, and of the vast potential of the future.

Congress must act now to expand these opportunities and to make them into realities. Americans care very deeply about our energy problem, for they know how fundamentally it impacts their jobs, their health, and their national security.

Passage of this legislation is essential if we want to be able to tell the people of America that we are taking positive action, that we are responding to this critical problem, and that we are willing and capable of assuming the leadership in this vital area.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is now experiencing a tremendous financial burden caused in part by the present energy shortage. Our balance of payments has again swung to a deficit and recent price rises may cost the American consumer $40 billion in the next year. Our heavy dependence on foreign oil, dramatically highlighted by the Arab oil boycott, has made us vulnerable to the national policies of a group of foreign countries. A solution to this situation requires immediate and effective Federal initiative.

Realizing the importance of energy research and development activities, the House Appropriations Committee has incorporated all energy measures funded by the Federal Government into a single bill. Passage of this bill today will assure that these appropriations will be available by the first day of the new fiscal year. This will prevent any delays in the planning and administration of critical energy programs.

The committee recommends over $2.2 billion in new budget authority for energy research and development activities as a significant step in moving our Nation toward energy independence. The bill represents a 70-percent increase in appropriations over the previous year, stressing energy research and development in the fields of atomic energy and coal gasification and liquefaction.

Today with passage of this appropriation bill, H.R. 14434 we will, again as a Nation, be taking a dramatic step to overcome another crisis, the energy shortage.

The major items recommended in this bill include: $1,507,760,000 for energy research and development efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission, including funds for accelerated research for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, nuclear reactor safety research, development of nuclear materials, space nuclear systems and nuclear fusion; $571,933,000 for the Interior Department which includes significantly expanded coal research activities including gasification and liquefaction and mining research efforts and $59.7 million for the Office of Petroleum Allocation; $101,800,000 for the National Science Foundation which includes major funding for solar and geothermal energy research; $54,000,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency to develop methods to control pollutants associated with energy extraction, transmis-

sion, production, conversion, and use; $19,000,000 for the Federal Energy Office for the overall management of national energy policy; $8,935,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for energy research and development projects which utilize capabilities developed in the space program; and $6,400,000 for the Department of Transportation to continue and accelerate its program of improving the efficiency of energy utilization of the Nation's transportation system.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14434 but, moreover, in support of the overall concept it represents.

It is essential that the Congress bring the Federal budget under control. It is one of the major causes of today's inflation. To do this, we must first set priorities and then provide the necessary funds in a reasonable, orderly manner.

The Appropriations Committee has done just this in approving a special energy appropriations bill. Recognizing that energy independence at the earliest possible date is of the highest priority, the committee has set out to group together all the funds from the budgets of the various agencies and departments involved in energy research and development into one bill which can then be acted on by the Congress in an organized and timely fashion.

The departments and agencies responsible for finding the answers to our energy demands need a clear and definite go ahead signal from the Congress so that they can begin planning and administering the critical energy research and development programs promptly and efficiently. Not knowing where they stand or how comprehensive a program they should set up causes great confusion and results in misdirected efforts and wasted funds.

We have seen the identical problem result from the uncertainty and delay that has characterized educational funding in recent years. It is a prime example of the problems that can arise from uncertain funding practices.

I would strongly urge the committee to adopt a similar practice for education spending plans and bring a bill promptly before the House.

The major emphasis of the bill before us is to accelerate the Federal energy research and development effort. We are keenly aware now that unless we make a strong, dedicated commitment to this goal, our national energy needs will continue to grow at a far greater rate than our ability to find domestic sources.

There is no one among us who does not know that dependence upon foreign sources is a precarious and dangerous position to be in.

But we also know that independence does not come overnight. It can only follow a tremendous effort toward finding and developing new sources and more efficient use of those already at hand.

H.R. 14434 provides the funding to get this effort underway and, at the same time, provides money for the interim measures needed to cope with our present situation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the energy research and development appropriations bill, H.R. 14434. This legislation would appropriate some $2.27 billion for energy research and development, essential in order to develop new sources of clean energy to help meet our growing needs.

The intent of this legislation is clear; to accelerate the Federal program of energy research. Naturally, I am in favor of such measures, but I must take exception to the proposed levels of appropriation. The major emphasis of this bill lies with the development of atomic energy. Over $1.5 billion or over two-thirds of the total, is earmarked for atomic energy research. In contrast, only $100 million is to be expended on solar and geothermal energy research, and only $34 million on chemical coal cleaning technology. This heavy emphasis upon nuclear power overlooks the benefits of developing techniques which would enable us to use coal, our most abundant resource, cleanly and efficiently. It strikes me as terribly wasteful to ignore the immediate advantages of coal in exchange for developing nuclear powerplants in the United States, which would expose Americans to nuclear pollution and possible thermonuclear accidents.

I find it particularly disheartening that this bill would recommend the widespread use of coal without first specifically appropriating funds for the development of powerplant scrubbing techniques. In many of our major cities the use of coal could exacerbate existing health problems because of the resulting pollution. However, if research is encouraged, methods could be developed to burn coal in our existing powerplants cleanly and efficiently so that air quality standards can be adhered to. We must develop the necessary technology for clean coal as well as coal gasification and liquefaction.

In order to develop all possible clean energy sources, greater sums for solar and geothermal research are required. The disparity between the amounts appropriated for atomic energy and solar energy clearly illustrates the second-class status of the latter. It is noteworthy that a recent report by the Atomic Energy Commission which promoted the use of solar energy as a clean and plentiful source of energy was suppressed. For years solar energy research has been unfairly downgraded because it threatens the private sector's commitment to nuclear power. The technology for solar energy is well know, this bill could foster its use by increasing the funding and thus encourage pilot projects to take place all over the country.

At this time I would also like to express my support for the Roncalio amendment which would eliminate the "Plowshare" program. This program, which would encourage the use of nuclear explosive to extract oil and gas, is an unnecessary hazard.

In the past, this Nation has supplied itself with abundant and efficient sources of energy. Wood, coal, petroleum, and natural gas were secured easily and made human and industrial expansion in the United States possible. We must turn once again to our technology for new methods of securing clean energy. I am encouraged that this bill provides the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with funding to utilize capabilities developed in the space program to meet our energy shortage.

While I have doubts about the emphasis placed on nuclear fuels, I intend to support this measure. I do so because it is essential that we start immediately to develop the technology required to meet our energy needs in the years ahead.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I represent the hard coal capital of the world, the coal-ripe land of northeastern Pennsylvania, where there sits the largest hard coal veins in the world. Many of those veins are in my district, particularly in Luzerne, Carbon, and Sullivan Counties.

I know coal well. My father worked the mines for many years, and my grandfather, Attorney Daniel McCartney, was the first general counsel of the United Mine Workers of America, a friend of John Mitchell. So, you see, I am familiar with the anthracite in a very real way.

In the mid-1920's, there were 64,000 persons employed in the anthracite coal mines. When I first came to the House, there were about 35,000, at the end of World War II. Today, there are scarcely 3,000.

The anthracite coal industry of Pennsylvania should receive special treatment under the legislation we are considering. Prior to the closing of the Anthracite Coal Research Laboratory in 1964, the Bureau of Mines conducted extensive research in anthracite. This research was both basic and applied, relating to new mining methods and to new uses for anthracite. Large-scale demonstrations were conducted on gasification of the Keystone State's anthracite in gasification research on Lurgi equipment in Dorsten, Germany. In addition, in the underground mines of Luzerne County, mining research was conducted in long wall mining and mining of anthracite hydraulically. These experiments were quite successful but the industry was then on the downgrade, other fuels were plentiful, and the economic situation favored other fuels.

The research laboratory was staffed with highly qualified scientists and engineers, but it was closed by the Bureau of Mines with the thought that such research could be conducted at the Bureau's research stations at Pittsburgh and Morgantown, W. Va. It is, Mr. Chairman, well-known that very little research on anthracite has been undertaken by the Bureau of Mines since the closing of the laboratory. Funds actually expended on the anthracite mining industry and utilization research from fiscal 1964 through fiscal 1973 have been virtually nil. There should, therefore, be some authority calling for a laboratory in the anthracite area dedicated to this large, low-sulphur energy resource.

Remaining anthracite reserves total approximately 16 billion net tons, of

which 8 billion are considered minable. Any figures on coal reserves considered recoverable are dependent largely on current technology, method of mining and value received for the product. Anthracite was considered a costly fuel at the time of past research. The cost of other fuels has increased greatly in recent months, possibly placing anthracite in a better economic position. In view of the energy situation confronting the United States today and in the foreseeable future, the 16 billion tons of low-sulphur fuel, located approximately 100 miles from Metropolitan New York and Philadelphia, should not be overlooked.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration relating to programs and other activities in research and development, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $8,935,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $4,500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available only upon the enactment of H.R. 11864 or similar legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: Page 2, line 21, strike the amount "$8,935,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$9,935,000".

Page 2, lines 22 through 24, strike all after the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for the past 3 hours very carefully to every word of this debate. It has been an excellent debate. The Committee on Appropriations is to be congratulated for coming forward with a bill which comprehensively packages all the energy-related appropriations of the many agencies.

During the consideration of the NASA authorization bill last Thursday, the House supported my amendment to provide an increase of $3.9 million for transfer of space-related technology from NASA for improving the extraction of coal and providing for more efficient combustion of coal; $3.9 million was authorized.

I had a very pleasant conference with the very able gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) who chairs the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. She persuaded me it would be more acceptable to the committee to offer an amendment for only a $1 million increase for NASA, rather than the fully authorized $3.9 million. So in a burst of rampant economy, Mr. Chairman, I have decided to reduce this amendment to $1 million. If the space program is going to mean anything, it must consist of more than just picking rocks off the Moon and the billions of dollars that we have spent and are spending on space can very easily be utilized to speed up and to apply the excellent technology that we have developed in the space program.

Let me give several illustrations. At the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., 20 General Electric hydrocarbon detectors have been used for the purpose of detecting hydrogen leaks in the fuel tanks of launch vehicles. Currently, under funding by NASA in collaboration with the Bureau of Mines, these hydrocarbon detectors are being tested for detecting methane in coal mines.

At the Ames Research Center in California, NASA-funded research work is proceeding in testing fire-retarding material and to apply the technology in quickly suppressing fires at the instant of ignition. This research can be applied to reduce the danger of fire and explosion in coal mines.

The additional $1 million can be utilized by NASA for such useful research as the application of NASA's work in magnetic fluids to the separation of scrap from coal. These are only a few of the illustrations of how NASA can profitably use this modest increase to improve the efficiency of coal extraction and combustion.

Work is going on at the University of Kentucky presently jointly funded by NASA and the Bureau of Mines to utilize the technology of the lunar rover vehicle for an unmanned surveillance vehicle that can go into mines and test safety, both after explosions and in the ordinary course of mining.

I congratulate the Members of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) all of whom emphasized the advantages of duplication of basic research from different approaches in the several agencies charged with responsibility. Thus, the fact that the Bureau of Mines, the Atomic Energy Commission, Environmental Protection Agency, National Science Foundation, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration are all doing research in coal is a plus in terms of speeding up the solution of difficult problems in the extraction and burning of coal.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment and I intend to support it.

On another note, would the gentleman answer me this question relative to what the chairman of the committee, Mr. MAHON, was taking about; that is, the difficulty that has caused our search for new sources of energy when "roadblocks" are sometimes, placed as a hindrance to further this search rather than incentives. For example, would it not present an additional difficulty to those who were doing the testing of coal to find out whether or not we could make oil or gas out of coal, if the cost of the extraction was $7.50 a barrel to get oil out of coal, and the price of the final product was $7.50 per barrel. That rollback price of $7.50 a barrel would serve to discourage rather than encourage people to work on the development of gas or oil out of coal; would it not?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Certainly, there has been a tremendous increase in both the price of coal and oil over the past few months, such as to cause the consumer to suffer. I would not conceive that a price rollback would affect research in the area affected by my amendment.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I can see where under certain circumstances it could, but nevertheless I think the gentleman's amendment is very good.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts who so brilliantly presides over the HUD-Space-Science-Veterans Appropriations Subcommittee, that he very well said during the hearings, on page 199:

> We think that NASA ought to be the lead agency in solving the great problems we have regarding energy. We established NASA as the cutting edge of technology, and technology apparently is absolutely essential in trying to solve the energy crisis. This agency, which has magnificent expertise, great knowledge, great leadership, and fantastic personnel, it would seem, should be the agency that ought to be at the eroding edge of the energy crisis, and using some of its talents and its knowledge to solve some of the problems.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, which provides a modest increase of only $1 million.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose this amendment for a number of reasons, one of them being that I have a high regard for the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia and have always commended him for his concern with coal research and the use of coal in solving the energy problem.

Mr. Chairman, what his amendment seeks to do is to add $1 million to chapter II, specifically with reference to that amount for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The committee reported in this chapter for NASA, $2 million for space applications projects related to energy, and another $2,435,000 for studies and research in the space and nuclear research and technology program. In addition to that, we added a proviso that the gentleman from West Virginia would strike out. That proviso would provide $4,500,000 to be made available upon the enactment of H.R. 11864, the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act, which was overwhelmingly passed by this House not too long ago.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes a mistake here because, as I read the information that was developed by the Science and Astronautics Committee that reported that bill, some 25 percent of energy demands are used in heating and cooling residences and buildings.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would agree

to a unanimous-consent request that this language be retained, I would like to get that language in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be amended to read simply, "Page 2, line 21, strike the amount '$8,935,000' and insert in lieu thereof the amount '$9,935,000'."

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to yield for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, even with the proviso back into this section of the bill, I again reluctantly oppose this particular amendment. The Department of the Interior is the lead agency for coal research and this bill now carries—and I hope this makes an impression upon the members of the committee who are on the floor—this bill now carries $390 million for the Department of the Interior, $4.5 million for the Atomic Energy Commission, and $4.2 million for the National Science Foundation. All of this is to be directed to coal research.

One of the problems in dealing with this energy bill is the potential for duplication. This could waste both funds and manpower resources.

Are we getting into an overlapping which will run the cost of energy research up to a point where we are actually wasting an awful lot of money on programs that may not be feasible? That is the problem we face.

This is not to say that the programs outlined in the additional views of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia on the NASA authorization bill are not worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that many of these programs are now being researched by the Department of the Interior or by the Atomic Energy Commission or by the National Science Foundation. As has been indicated, there are four lead agencies in energy: The Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of the Interior, the National Science Foundation, and the Atomic Energy Commission. All of them are supposedly coordinating their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is an absolute necessity on the part of the Members of Congress to be sure that we are not wasting money in this area. A great many sins can be committed in the name of energy. I think we all realize that. Because of that, but primarily because there is $400 million in this bill for the very purposes that the gentleman from West Virginia wants to accomplish, we ought to vote the amendment down.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to take one minute to reiterate what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said. We can all agree in principle with what the gentleman from West Virginia wants, but I believe that the necessary amounts are already in the budget in several places. NASA testified that they were satisfied with their budget request, and I believe they want to go ahead with some of the things that the gentleman asked for. We have many millions of dollars in the energy portion of this bill that we are taking up now, and there are other bills coming up later, which are for NASA appropriations and which will include some of the things that the gentleman from West Virginia seeks. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 2, line 21, strike "$8,935,000" and substitute "$10,935,000".

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase the funds appropriated to NASA by an additional $2 million. These additional funds will be used by NASA to conduct studies into the production and utilization of hydrogen as a fuel.

Mr. Chairman, I was gratified by the action of the House last Thursday when it was agreed to increase NASA's budget authorization to enable this vital research to be conducted. I know the Committee is well aware of the tremendous potential of hydrogen as a fuel source for the future. It offers us a limitless supply of pollution-free energy with a wide range of potential uses. Most research is now focused on utilizing hydrogen as a substitute for gasoline. Beyond this application, hydrogen also offers us a possible alternative to our dwindling supplies of natural gas. However, in order to exploit the vast potential of this remarkable fuel, we must first develop the technology to produce hydrogen economically and utilize it safely. At present, there is little Government involvement in hydrogen research—the burden of funding has fallen to the inadequate resources of the private sector.

We must not allow this situation to continue. My amendment offers us an opportunity of establishing a direction, a goal, and a timetable for hydrogen research. We must begin now to explore the future benefits of an economy based on the use of hydrogen fuel.

As the Committee knows, the administration has followed a policy of designating a lead agency to coordinate research efforts into new energy technologies. For example, the National Science Foundation is the lead agency in solar research; the Department of Interior is the lead agency in coal and geothermal research; and of course the Atomic Energy Commission is the lead agency for the development of nuclear technology.

However, I know of no lead agency that has been designated for hydrogen research. It is my hope that this amendment will bring the administration to consider designating NASA as the lead agency for research into hydrogen as a general purpose fuel. NASA already has unqualified expertise in dealing with hydrogen as a fuel for spacecraft. I know, for example, that the Lewis Flight Research Center in Cleveland has conducted extensive studies in spacecraft propulsion systems. It is time we utilized the benefit of the space program—and the excellent facilities such as NASA Lewis—to help us solve the tremendously perplexing problems in our energy future.

I hope the Committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

What my distinguished and longtime friend, the gentleman from Ohio, seeks to do is add more funds for hydrogen research. The gentleman from Ohio is absolutely correct as to the potential hydrogen offers as clean energy fuel source in the future. I could not agree with him more as to its merits.

It is one of the cleanest and probably one of the best fuels that may be developed down the road some day.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries at least $270,000 for the express purpose that the gentleman from Ohio seeks to accomplish. It is in the NASA budget and is listed as a project for research on hydrogen production and utilization systems. There is also money in here for hydrogen injection into fuel.

Beyond the funds included in this bill for NASA there is another $5 million in the National Science Foundation budget attuned to hydrogen research in a great number of areas.

I do not disagree with the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio, because I think he is absolutely right when he says hyrodgen is a fuel which may meet a great deal of the energy demands of this Nation. I am delighted to say to him that one of the best laboratories in the whole NASA complex is the Lewis Research Center in Ohio, which is conducting the very research he is interested in.

I can assure the gentleman that this is a matter we will be very careful to look at because it has tremendous potential. I do not think, though, that this is the bill, the time, nor the place to insert $2 million for this research.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. In view of the colloquy I had with the distinguished chairman and his assurance that hydrogen research will be given greater emphasis in appropriation bills and in pending programs, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Ohio, but I agree with him totally that NASA has tremendous expertise and knowledge and has been working for many, many years with hydrogen as a fuel. I hope when the Policy Committee of the Energy Research and Development Administration establishes policy and responsibilities that it will be sure NASA gets enough research money to make the hydrogen program a feasible one.

Mr. VANIK. And a meaningful program.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies. Federal, State, or private: *Provided*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I use this time to ask the able gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, whether a separate bill will be brought in to cover health and safety in coal mines. We are putting in a tremendous amount of money here to increase production. We have a shortage of manpower, as everyone knows, in the mines. One of the deterrents to getting that manpower is the fact that the accident rate in our mines is still so high that it is the most hazardous occupation in the Nation. It is very, very important that the Congress vote additional funds for the protection of the health and safety of miners if we are going to increase production.

I would simply like to ask the gentlewoman from Washington if it is her intention in a future bill to increase the funding for protecting the health and safety of coal miners.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia that when I made my earlier comments about this bill I mentioned that certain energy-related programs were left out of this bill and will be considered in the context of the regular appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies. One program left out of this bill is strip mine reclamation research conducted by the U.S. Forest Service. Coal mine health and safety programs, both research and enforcement, will be considered in the regular Interior bill.

I would say to the gentleman from West Virginia that there is money in this bill for research work on better technology for deep coal mining, which has some relation to health and safety. But the gentleman is correctly advised that we will treat the matter of mine health and safety programs in the regular Interior bill.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN). Because of the fact that our deep-minable resources and reserves far exceed strippable reserves, I am very heartened by her comments on the improvements in deep mining techniques.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; $1,043,790,000 and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COUGHLIN

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUGHLIN: Page 8, before the period in line 2, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be obligated, expended, or used for research, development, or other activities relating to the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor until the Commission has submitted to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a detailed breakdown of the total planned costs for the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor program research operations and construction and (1) a period of thirty days has passed (after the submission of such breakdown), or (2) such committees (before the expiration of such period) have transmitted to the Commission written notice to the effect that they have no objection to any such obligation, expenditure, or use".

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment in that the amendment as proposed would impose additional duties and would also be contingent legislation on an appropriation, and therefore is subject to a point of order.

The language of the amendment says:

That no part of this appropriation shall be obligated, expended, or used for research, development, or other activities relating to the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor until the Commission has submitted. . . .

A report, and so forth; so this would impose additional duties, and is therefore legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely seeks to delay the obligation of funds for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor until a report, which the committee has already directed be provided, and this is so stated in the committee report, until that report is available. The amendment seeks only to have a cost breakdown of what expenditures are going to be made for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, and what the total estimated costs of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor are.

It seems to me that these must be available to this committee before we are to evaluate whether we are going to appropriate almost half a billion dollars for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor. Such a report has already been requested by the committee as indicated in the committee report.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAMILTON). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN) makes the statement against the point of order raised by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) that the committee report requests the Atomic Energy Commission to submit a breakdown of the total planned costs but the Chair is not aware of such a specific requirement under existing law. Under Cannon's Precedents, volume 7, section 1442, a proposition to establish new affirmative directions for an executive officer constitutes legislation, and is not in order on a general appropriation bill.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN) does require submission to Congress by the AEC of an entire breakdown of the total planned cost for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor. The amendment is thus in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the ruling of the Chair. I think it is not only parliamentary right, but I think it was right on the basis of the merits. I was prepared to speak against this amendment. If there is anything that has been looked at carefully, it is the liquid metal fast breeder reactor. We started on research and development on this, and the Joint Committee authorized the first money about 12 years ago. There are at least 10 years of research and development on this particular item. We have had repeated estimates. There have been delays, and in the meantime inflation has taken place.

In the last 2 or 3 years inflation has gone up about 22 percent on materials and on labor and on every other factor that goes into it. It is impossible to go into a long-range program of research and development of massive proportion and estimate to the penny what it is going to cost. We can have general estimates, but as we go along developing anything that is of very much impor-

tance, the prices change, and the inflation occurs.

So the basis of the gentleman's amendment is not realistic for a research and development program of the tremendous size of this project.

However, I want to speak for just a minute on what we are talking about in this liquid metal fast breeder reactor. We have proven the principles in the laboratories of the AEC. This means, to the best of the testimony that we have from the greatest scientists in the United States and the greatest engineers, that if we are successful in this program, as we have been successful in the laboratory, and if we are successful in building the full-sized reactor which we plan to do, and which already has been authorized, we will bring into existence a quantity of energy which will amount to at least 40 to 50 percent of the total energy we need by the year 2000. By the year 1990 we should be well into this with probably the second or third reactor. We know what this is going to cost in general, but we cannot know exactly.

However, we know this much—that it will give 60 to 80 percent more heat out of a gram of uranium than we get now. This means if we have 100 years of supply of uranium at this time and we get 60 times the heat out of a gram of uranium, we will have a heat source for 6,000 years. That is what we are talking about, and we do not want to be under bondage to the sheiks in the Middle East for oil at blackmail prices.

We imported $7½ billion worth of oil in 1973 at $2.75 to $3.25 a barrel—$7½ billion. If we imported the same amount of oil today, it would cost us $22 billion. Think what that would do to the value of the dollar. The thing that we are trying to do is to become self-sufficient. We are not going to do it in a few years; we are going to have to do it over the balance of this century. We are going to be working on it by the year 2000, and still we will not have all of the energy we need because the constant need for energy goes up.

We have to learn a lot of things. We have to learn to burn coal without the environment being polluted. We have to learn to burn oil without air pollution, and we have to increase our supply of oil with offshore development. We are going to have to liquefy coal. We are going to have to learn to gasify coal for cleaner transportation. So, when we start fooling with something that has had the attention of the committee now, and the approval of this Congress, for the last 13 years, and we start throwing monkeywrenches in this kind of machinery, we do violence to the goal of self-sufficiency in energy in this country.

I say it is a serious matter, and I hope that no similar amendments will be offered to this part of the bill, or to any other part that seeks to give us an energy supply that we have to have in this country if we are going to keep the standard of living the way it is, and if we are going to take care of the million young men who come into employment status every year.

We are going to have to do something because energy is the basis of all of our employment and our standard of living.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my concern with the liquid metal fast breeder reactor is not in opposition to nuclear energy as such. I served, before going on the House Appropriations Committee, on the Task Force on Energy of the House Science Committee and that experience led me to very serious concerns about the costs involved in the liquid metal fast breeder reactor program as well as whether that process would be obsolete before it even became effective.

I have tried in vain to get figures about the cost of this program. I have tried through the Committee on Atomic Energy and through the Office of Management and Budget, but the figures that we have been able to get are not very reassuring.

The original cost estimate in April of 1969 estimated a total cost of $3.8 billion and a completion date of 1984. That has now escalated to $8.3 billion and a completion date of 1987. In the breakdown the fast flux testing facility which is part of this program originally was estimated to cost $87.5 million and will now cost $925 million, an increase of 1,000 percent. The demonstration plant for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor which was expected to cost initially $400 million is now up to $700 million and will probably be closer to $1 billion, or 2.5 times its original cost.

I repeat that I am not opposed to nuclear energy, but I am opposed to research projects where we do not know what we are spending the money for and where we do not know how much it is going to cost and where there is a tremendous likelihood that the money will be spent for something that will be obsolete as soon as it is produced.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the committee has expressed some of the concerns the gentleman has indicated. We put language in our report indicating that we want a current cost estimate before we fund this project further. We are concerned about cost overruns and we are concerned about cost escalation. So we have directed that the AEC give us more precise figures. However, at this juncture we know it is going to cost in excess of $1 billion. We know it will cost a tremendous amount of money. We know that and we have asked for an up-to-date cost estimate before proceeding.

Mr. COUGHLIN. But we are appropriating a half billion for something, and we do not know what it is going to be spent on.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We know it will be spent on developing the LMFBR technology.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. RONCALIO OF WYOMING

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming: Chapter IV, Atomic Energy Commission, page 7, line 15, strike the figure "$1,043,790,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,039,765,000".

Chapter IV, Atomic Energy Commission, page 8, line 11, under Plant and Capital Equipment, strike the figure "$463,970,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$463,660,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse prompt approval of full funding for all but one of the very worthy energy research and development activities assembled in this special appropriations bill. After carefully studying the Atomic Energy Commission's fiscal year 1975 plans for their work with development of nuclear natural resource recovery technologies, I am once again bound in good conscience to rise in opposition.

I would like to offer amendments which will strike all operating expenses and additional equipment funding for the applications of the underground explosions program, except those moneys needed to complete evaluation of the Rio Blanco nuclear gas stimulation experiment.

Mr. Chairman, the AEC program plans for fiscal year 1975 call for $1.925 million for developing nuclear explosive methods for in situ recovery of oil from shale, $1.6 million for research, development, and testing of nuclear explosives for natural resource recovery, $300,000, for studies of nuclear explosive effects, $200,000, for development of nuclear methods for in situ mining of large ore bodies, and $310,000, for new plant facilities and equipment. Only $375,000 is requested for nuclear gas stimulation, and only a portion of that is planned for evaluation of Rio Blanco's disappointing results.

My colleagues, $4.335 million of this funding is earmarked for development of virtually new nuclear blasting methods. I ask you to support my amendments which will delete funding for all of these new major undertakings, including those with oil shale and ore recovery.

Before proceeding, I would like to acknowledge the solid support which the Colorado delegation has expressed for my amendments.

I am very grateful to each of them for joining me today in sending a joint letter asking the support of all of the House Members.

My colleagues, I call upon each of you to consider, as we from Wyoming and Colorado must, the goals of this program. To be effective, nuclear natural resource recovery will, by the AEC's own admission, entail detonation of literally thousands of nuclear explosions. Yet, it is a fact that the recovered resources could at best meet only a few percent of our national energy needs.

We, the representatives of Wyoming and Colorado, know that our people oppose the wastes and fear the potential dangers which these nuclear blasting technologies will bring to our western lands.

My colleagues, I have upon almost every suitable occasion filled the record with my findings and questions about Plowshare failures and disappointments. I have noted for you the growing ranks of those who have serious reservations about the Plowshare program.

I have reported to you that Secretary of Interior Rogers C. B. Morton in a February 22, 1974, letter to me stated:

Indeed it has been the position of the Department that implementation of the full-field Rio Blanco development would preclude orderly and efficient development of the overlying oil shale resource . . .

Clearly, we cannot afford this.

I have pointed out more doubts, raised on April 2, 1974, when the General Accounting Office released its report "Progress and Problems in Developing Nuclear and Other Experimental Techniques for Recovering Natural Gas in the Rocky Mountain Area." The GAO noted that there was disagreement between the AEC and the Bureau of Mines over whether fractures created in the Gasbuggy and Rulison nuclear gas stimulation experiments are closing, and stated that if the fractures created by nuclear detonation close, the wellhead cost of gas increases significantly. The Comptroller General then concluded:

Because this issue is important to the economics of nuclear stimulation and its cost comparison with massive hydraulic fracturing, more should be done to minimize the uncertainty on this issue before nuclear stimulation can be considered economically acceptable . . .

And that—

Underground mining of oil shale might be incompatible with the prior or concurrent use of nuclear stimulation because fractures created by the nuclear explosives might collapse underground mines in the area of the explosion . . . we consider it important to resolve this question as soon as practicable . . .

I have also directed your attention to the objections of former Governor of Colorado and Director of the Energy Policy Office, John Love, and to the doubts about the effectiveness of recovering resources through underground nuclear explosions that have been raised by the U.S. Geological Service, by the Shell Oil Co., and a number of other private studies.

Mr. Chairman, I view the fiscal year 1975 AEC budget plans for its applications of underground explosions program as directly counter to the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that Rio Blanco's uncertainties be resolved before proceeding with other major experiments. I view them as counter to the Appropriations Committee report which itself recommends that greater emphasis be placed on chemical—as opposed to nuclear—explosion technology research.

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that continuation of this program, now in progress for more than 16 years and still remaining without successful recovery of any usable natural resource, is even contrary, in my judgment, to recent statements by AEC Chairman Dixy Lee Ray. In testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on her report to the President on "The Nation's Energy Future," Dr. Ray said that each of our national energy research programs "should be funded on its merits, accelerated when it succeeds, and terminated or cut back severely when it fails after a reasonable amount of effort." I think that you will have to agree that Government investment—not to mention that of industry—of more than $150 million and more than 16 years of study and experimentation is more than a reasonable amount of time, money, and effort.

The Plowshare program still remains unsuccessful in virtually all of its endeavors, as you can even see from the very latest April 29, 1974, issue of Time magazine—pages 100–102—that carries an article entitled "A Blank for Blanco" which is being inserted in today's RECORD. I must contend therefore, that Plowshare should be subject to the modest cutbacks called for in my amendments.

I would like to repeat my firm belief that full-field use of the literally thousands of nuclear explosions, which will be required for effective energy resource recovery will never receive the approval of the people of this Nation. This being the case, I respectfully ask your support for my amendments which will insure compliance with the Joint Committee recommendations against Plowshare's expansion into new areas and insure compliance with the Appropriations Committee recommendation of a greater and more balanced effort using the nonnuclear methods now being undertaken in the Department of the Interior.

I ask that you join me in deleting funding for all underground nuclear explosion work other than the $375,000 needed for completion of Rio Blanco's evaluation. In my view, it is unconscionable for us to authorize $4.335 million for experiments which will again allow Plowshare to leave its most recent failures in gas stimulation and move on into another new area of disappointment.

I appeal to all of you to vote for the amendments I am submitting here today.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do so with great reluctance because of my high regard and respect for the gentleman from Wyoming. I would say that he is a distinguished member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. But, he was the sole member of that committee who voted to cut this item. He was a single voice. The gentleman did come before our committee and asked that this program be cut, but again our committee was unanimous in voting to provide the funds recommended in the bill.

This item was in the President's budget. It is recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and it is recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out, as I did in the general debate, that there are no funds in the bill for this program to conduct a nuclear explosion in fiscal year 1975. These funds are incidental to the research efforts needed for the development of our energy resources such as natural gas, oil shale, which have been unavailable and uneconomical to mine by conventional means for commercial purposes. These funds really continue a low level of funding for continued research in developing new technology; research and evaluation of previous tests, such as the Rio Blanco and other tests. The funds included in the bill are not for nuclear explosions in 1975. We feel that it is essential to develop this technology for the future, in the event it is needed.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the whole Colorado delegation is asking the membership of this House to vote for this amendment and to strike this $4 million from the program. This is not a partisan issue; neither is this an issue where we are taking an environmental position versus a developmental position; neither are any of us opposed to the development of an energy resource which is supposed to save the world, at least according to some of the proponents of this $4 million program.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the membership of the House what we are actually talking about. The Plowshare program is a three-shot program. Two of those three took place in my district in western Colorado. There has been no gas commercially marketed as a result of those shots. The third shot has yet to be fully evaluated.

The people of Colorado were led to believe that after the third shot there would be no further test and no further planning until the last shot was fully evaluated, and then we could come back and say, "Okay, the program is either successful and we will continue with it, or it is not successful and we will stop it."

But, the $4 million planned here is part of a $107 million program. The $4 million is planning, as the colloquy which took place between the gentleman from California and myself last week indicated, the first plans for the continuation of this $107 million program for which the tests will be conducted at the Nevada test site after the plans are prepared, if this $4 million program goes through. Next year, they will come before the House and ask for funds to continue the testing program in Nevada. When are we going to be willing to say, "Let us wait and evaluate?"

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman used the word "evaluate," he would be in favor of getting information from the previous test to evaluate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, there is $375,000 left in this program which we are requesting be left in for final evaluation of the Rio Blanco shot. We are simply saying that the $4 million, which is not part of the evaluation program, be deducted until we get

the final evaluation of the Rio Blanco shot. Now, is that unreasonable?

Why should we go ahead with additional planning until we have final results back on the last shot? That seems to me to be an eminently reasonable position.

It is not an environmental position. It seems to me it is not scientific to go ahead until we have the final results back on Rio Blanco.

Mr. Chairman, all we say is that we should wait. The entire delegation is asking for this. There is no particularly big rush on this kind of program.

I would like to point out that the oil companies have committed themselves to spending hundreds of millions of dollars in oil shale development by conventional means. They are already going ahead with the development of oil shale. They are not waiting for the Government to go ahead and blast to develop an atomic method of extracting shale. The companies have already made a commitment for hundreds of millions of dollars to extract shale by other means.

So we are not going to hold up the development of oil shale until this program is continued. They have already committed themselves for $317 million on 10,000-leased acres out of a total of 7 million acres in western Colorado. So we can see that they are very serious about developing this under conventional means.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Wyoming has taken an eminently reasonable position, and I do not understand why everyone is insisting that we spend the $4 million. We do not want it yet. As a matter of fact, we have appealed for planning, the amount of a few hundred thousand for planning money for water resource development. We cannot get that money. We cannot develop the oil shale fields in western Colorado until we have the water resources developed to provide for the people. We cannot get a few hundred thousand for water resource planning, but we insist on spending $4 million for this program, and we do not know whether it is successful or not, because we do not know the results of the last shot.

So let us please wait and let us adopt this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. Chairman, the entire Colorado delegation asks the Members to do that. Let us wait and see what the results of the Rio Blanca shot are.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the remarks just made by the gentleman from Colorado were most appropriate. Those remarks certainly speak my feelings, as do the statements which were made by my colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

I would like to add a new aspect to this, as to how the people of Colorado feel about these continued shots.

Unlike some areas of this country, water is the lifeblood of our current economy and any possibility for future development.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the Members that if we begin setting off these underground atomic explosions, if the Members do not think that this grabs at the vitals of the people of Colorado they are mistaken. I can assure you that this will scare them to death, particularly insofar as it concerns the possibility of contamination of our water supply.

Mr. Chairman, when my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) suggests that sometime in the future this means it may be that underground atomic explosions may be used to develop water, we are even more concerned, because we are worried now that our underground water may be contaminated if we get to the point of a large-scale production of atomic explosions for the purpose of securing gas.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleagues, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) that if at this moment the Atomic Energy Commission could come before this body and say, "We have successfully developed the safe production of underground gas by the use of atomic explosions underground," I would be with them on this appropriation. This, however, they cannot do.

It is our strong hope that in the production of that gas they are not going to adversely affect either the oil shale production or the continued production of water in the State of Colorado. So, Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) and my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON) in asking the Members just simply to slow down and wait until we have had this proof presented to us.

Let us have the money which this amendment leaves in the bill for the study of the last explosions that were set off, and let us not get the cart before the horse with more money spent in planning more explosions at this time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has several times referred to "explosions." I call the gentleman's attention to the report and I call his attention to my own words; there are no funds in this bill for nuclear explosions.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am glad my colleague has mentioned that again, and I also mention to my friend that I understand as well that this money is for the planning of additional explosions.

I have learned in the 9 years I have been here that sometimes we can find ourselves in the position of having spent so much money that we may say, "Why not go ahead and plan another explosion?"

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will support this amendment. This amendment cuts out the $400 million, and it does leave the money in here which is necessary to study those explosions which have occurred in the past.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments to reduce funding for the AEC program to use underground nuclear explosions for recovering natural resources.

These amendments would leave $375,000 to complete the Rio Blanco test evaluation, but would strike out $4,335,000 in funds unnecessary at this time. I agree with my colleagues from Colorado and Wyoming that Congress should not appropriate money for future underground explosions until we have a complete and final analysis of the Rio Blanco results.

Many have doubts about AEC's Plowshare program—a program where technology is in search of a use. The Department of Interior, the General Accounting Office, Shell Oil Co., the U.S. Geological Survey, and a University of Colorado study have all expressed significant doubts about the program to recover natural resources by underground nuclear explosions.

Last week when we debated this issue I had with me two articles from the Denver Post which reported that a pin hole leak in a disposal well for radioactive water from the Rio Blanco project had caused the release of this water back into the environment. Today, I have with me a recent article from Time magazine entitled "A Blank for Blanco." I would like to share it in full with my colleagues:

A BLANK FOR BLANCO

The project is part of the Atomic Energy Commission's Plowshare program and seemed like a promising peaceful use of nuclear energy. It calls for exploding small atomic bombs deep beneath the earth's surface to release trillions of cubic feet of natural gas trapped in subterranean rock formations. Now, after the latest in a series of test explosions in New Mexico and Colorado, AEC officials may be forced to acknowledge what some scientists predicted from the start: nuclear blasting for gas is neither economical nor practical.

Last May, in an operation named Project Rio Blanco, the AEC exploded three 30-kiloton devices that had been placed about 450 ft. apart in a vertical tube more than a mile underground near the hamlet of Meeker in western Colorado. The goal was to crack the surrounding sandstone and create a huge cavern into which the escaping gas could seep. But when the AEC and its private-industry collaborator, CER Geonuclear Corp. of Las Vegas, began test drilling at the site after the explosions, they made an embarrassing discovery. The blasts had apparently created three separate gas-filled caverns instead of one. Thus the amount of gas that flowed through the hole drilled into the uppermost cavern was disappointingly small.

Rio Blanco sponsors say that they are willing to spend another $1.5 million for additional drilling to recover gas from the lower cavities. But even if they can, the future of nuclear blasting for natural gas looks quite bleak. The program is already under attack from environmentalists who fear that the atomic explosions may damage buildings on the surface, trigger earthquakes and leave behind dangerous radiation. The General Accounting Office recently noted that nuclear recovery of gas could be costlier than its proponents originally thought; the cracks created in the sandstone by the A-bombs may close faster than the AEC's experts had predicted, limiting the amount of gas that could escape. In addition, the GAO touched on a subject worrying many oil companies. The natural gas deposits lie under much of the nation's reserves of shale, from which the companies hope some day to extract large quantities of oil. But the shale could become radioactive or otherwise damaged by the blasting, making it dangerous to mine.

Undaunted, the AEC has gone so far as to propose the use of nuclear explosions to get at the shale. Commission experts say that it would take some 50,000 separate nuclear explosions to help free the oil from the rock. Yet even the AEC's nuclear diehards may be having second thoughts about nuclear blasting. Last month the commission announced that it will help foot the bill for testing an alternate, nonnuclear gas recovery scheme called hydraulic fracturing. Employing high-pressure fluids rather than explosions to crack the gas-bearing sandstone, the test will take place only about a mile from the site of the multikiloton Rio Blanco fiasco.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments are backed by the entire Colorado delegation, the State were the Rio Blanco blast took place. They are an expression of a very simple and basic concept: That knowledge from an evaluation of Rio Blanco should set our future course, rather than a blind reliance on technology.

Mr. Chairman, let us put some faith in knowledge and save some taxpayers' money by supporting these amendments.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have been down this bumpy road a few times before.

My great and good and able and assidious and alert and agreeable and perspicacious and persistent friend from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) has tossed this amendment in every time he has had an oportunity to do so. As a matter of fact, I heard him giving grace at the dinner table one day, and I think he threw in something about it at that time, although I was not quite sure.

This thing has gone around so many times, each time I hear this debate it reminds me of the story the Congressman who went up in a balloon and got into some clouds and fog and got lost. When he came down he was close to a farm. He saw a farmer out there. He looked at the farmer and asked, "Where am I?" The farmer looked up at him and said, "You are in a balloon." Well, he was kind of taken aback at that, but he thought about the answer and he said, "Yes. That is indeed, indeed an answer that would be worthy of debate in the House of Representatives for these reasons: First, it is accurate insofar as it goes, but it does not go very far. It does address itself to the issue even though very, very ambiguously, and to the discussion, it contributes absolutely nothing not already known."

Indeed, we have nothing new here. It is the samc old saw playing the same old Colorado tune. The oil shale program is moving relatively swiftly right now. The oil shale interests have sold a lot of people a bill of goods about the explosions used to release another form of energy, natural gas, allegedly endangering new oil shale with radioactivity. They have managed to scare a lot of people with this misinformation. It is not true that this oil shale might become contaminated if you explore for natural gas with Plowshare methods in the same general area.

For a little variation on the arguments from this balloon they throw in a scare sometimes about the water supply. Well, there have been three of these underground explosions or experiments in the Colorado area. They have been conducted only following the most minute and exhaustive planning and totally accurate geological information with respect to the formations. All this is to insure that the water supply is protected with 100-percent assurance.

These attempts to scare people are simply a lot of hogwash. The amendment addresses a danger that does not exist.

Now, insofar as stopping this program is concerned, as my friend from Colorado on my side of the aisle wants to do, in order to get the results and evaluate them, he is asking you to come in and by law to violate every principle of scientific research that has contributed to the quality of American life. In scientific research you never proceed by making just one experiment, thoroughly analyze it and then move to another at some leisurely pace. You take the entire problem and work on it simultaneously. That is the way this United States of ours has been able to develop through research the technology that has produced a rich and great nation.

I would ask that this amendment be defeated if for no other reason than it attempts to turn back the scientific clock, and to lower upon us again the darkness of ignorance.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 193]

Anderson, Ill.	Gross	Patman
Archer	Gubser	Pickle
Bafalis	Haley	Pike
Blatnik	Harsha	Powell, Ohio
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Roberts
Clark	Hudnut	Rodino
Conyers	Jarman	Roncallo, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Kastenmeier	Rooney, N.Y.
Devine	Kazen	Rose
Diggs	Landrum	Satterfield
Dorn	McKinney	Sisk
Esch	Mathis, Ga.	Steele
Findley	Milford	Steiger, Ariz.
Foley	Mills	Stokes
Fraser	Minshall, Ohio	Stubblefield
Fulton	Mollohan	Stuckey
Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Gilman	Murphy, N.Y.	
Goldwater	Myers	Wyatt
Gray	O'Brien	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. HAMILTON) Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 14434, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 372 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment is one offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO). It is the same amendment that we considered last week in the House when we were considering and voting upon the authorization bill for the Atomic Energy Commission. The amendment is endorsed by several Members from Colorado. Their concern and that of its author, is with the further application of nuclear underground explosions in the States of Wyoming, Colorado and Utah or affecting that general area.

Now, the committee bill includes $4.4 million in operating expenses for the Atomic Energy Commission for its program known as "Applications of Underground Explosions."

Another $310,000 in the bill is for plant and capital equipment for the same program. The amendment before us would knock out of our bill those two items with the exception of $375,000, which would be left in the bill. It would strike from the bill all funds for "Applications of Underground Explosions" and for additional equipment therefor except for the $375,000 left to complete the Rio Blanco explosion evaluation. The Rio Blanco explosion is the third in that series of explosions conducted by the AEC, known as Plowshare underground nuclear testing.

Mr. Chairman, it is the committee's position that we fully understand the concerns expressed by the people of Wyoming, Colorado, and perhaps from Utah, over the further use of nuclear explosions for underground testing in that area, but there is a potential for using the AEC's expertise in underground fracturing of rock through explosive methods other than nuclear.

We were told during our hearings that the AEC could explore the so-called in situ process for developing oil shale or oil from oil shale rock with the use of conventional or chemical explosive rather than nuclear explosives.

I say again to the Members who were not here earlier that there are no funds included in this bill for actual nuclear underground explosions. There may be some moneys in this item for future planning for nuclear explosions, but if we should cut out all of this money by adopting this amendment then, as I understand the situation, the AEC will not have any funds with which to apply its expertise, and its experience in this field, to the question of research and development into the so-called in situ oil shale process underground, using, of course, chemical rather than nuclear explosives in that research effort.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wholly endorse the remarks in opposition to the amendment made by the gentleman from New York, who has astutely addressed himself to this problem, as has the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. Chairman, the House has previously defeated this type of amendment. We must, in my opinion, explore ways and means to deal effectively with the energy crisis. This is one of the things that the experts think is required. However, each Member should fully under-

stand that this bill does not provide funds for any nuclear explosions, and in fact the report prohibits underground nuclear explosions in this program for the coming year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to vote down the amendment.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas. I also wish to say that I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to confirm what the distinguished chairman has said. This is not an appropriation for a nuclear explosion. What we are doing here is to keep the option open so that if at some later time, not sooner than 2 or 3 years from now, it appears from all we learn through this research and evaluation here that this may be a practical way of doing something that badly needs to be done in developing an energy resource, that we have capability to do it at that time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and commend my colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) for offering this proposal.

I believe that there is some misunderstanding as to the exact effect of the gentleman's amendment, and I would like to offer it in this perspective: The question is not whether or not we are for or against this kind of testing, nor whether or not we are for or against conducting these tests next year or the year after that or at any particular time.

The question, as I understand the amendment which my colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming, has offered, is very simply whether or not we are going to evaluate the tests that have already been conducted before we begin planning the next test.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported these tests and I expect to do so in the future. But to me it is really foolish and it is unbecoming to the House to begin planning the next tests until we have fully evaluated the tests which have preceded this time. This, in fact, is the scheduling originally recommended by the AEC, and I think we ought to stick to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the House what these funds we are actually talking about have really been programed for, because there has been a lot of discussion directed toward that point: $1,925,000 is for the investigation of techniques to use nuclear methods for the possible recovery of oil from oil shale by in situ methods.

It is true that no actual nuclear experiment will be conducted during the fiscal year 1975, but it is for that specific purpose.

Mr. Chairman, $200,000 of the money is for the investigation of techniques for underground extraction of minerals, in situ, as the gentleman from New York pointed out; $300,000 is for the continued investigation of explosion effects; $1,600,000 is for research and development directed toward providing appropriate nuclear explosive designs for use in application for recovery of natural resources.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are kidding ourselves if we do not acknowledge that this money is to be used to plan for additional nuclear underground tests. All we are saying is wait until we have the evaluation of the Rio Blanco shot. That seems to me to be the most reasonable position we can have.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, a member of the committee.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I take this opportunity to say to those Members who were not here during the previous debate on this question to look at it in this light: We support this amendment. All we are asking for is some delay, some businesslike delay so that the Atomic Energy Commission can assess what it has already done. After 16 years and $150 million, we still have not produced one iota of gas that could be commercially used.

Again, in this area of Colorado and Wyoming in order to commercially bring it to production, they would have to fire off thousands of these shots, thousands of them.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply says, "Slow down. Take your time. Evaluate what you have already done before you ask for additional funds to plan additional explosions."

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope the Members will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 207, answered "present" 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—190

Abdnor	Badillo	Brinkley
Abzug	Bauman	Brotzman
Adams	Bennett	Broyhill, N.C.
Addabbo	Bergland	Burgener
Andrews, N. Dak.	Biaggi	Burke, Calif.
Annunzio	Biester	Burton
Armstrong	Bingham	Camp
Ashbrook	Brademas	Carney, Ohio
	Brasco	Chisholm
Clark	Jordan	Rosenthal
Clausen, Don H.	Karth	Rostenkowski
Clay	Kastenmeier	Roush
Cochran	Kemp	Rousselot
Cohen	Ketchum	Roy
Collins, Ill.	Kluczynski	Roybal
Conlan	Koch	Ryan
Conte	Kuykendall	Sandman
Conyers	Kyros	Sarasin
Culver	Lagomarsino	Sarbanes
Daniels, Dominick V.	Leggett	Schroeder
	Lehman	Sebelius
Delaney	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Dellums	Lott	Shoup
Denholm	Luken	Shriver
Dent	McCloskey	Shuster
Drinan	McCollister	Sisk
Dulski	McKinney	Skubitz
du Pont	Martin, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Eckhardt	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, Ala.	Mathis, Ga.	Stanton, J. William
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	
Esch	Mazzoli	Stanton, James V.
Evans, Colo.	Meeds	
Fascell	Melcher	Stark
Fish	Metcalfe	Steele
Foley	Mezvinsky	Steelman
Ford	Minish	Studds
Forsythe	Mink	Symms
Frenzel	Mitchell, Md.	Taylor, Mo.
Gettys	Mizell	Thompson, N.J.
Gilman	Moakley	Thone
Goodling	Moorhead, Calif.	Towell, Nev.
Grasso	Moorhead, Pa.	Traxler
Green, Pa.	Moss	Udall
Gross	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Gude	Murtha	Vander Veen
Gunter	Nedzi	Vanik
Guyer	Nelsen	Vigorito
Hanna	Obey	Waldie
Hanrahan	O'Hara	Whalen
Harrington	Owens	Widnall
Hawkins	Pettis	Wilson, Bob
Hays	Pike	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Hechler, W. Va.	Podell	
Heckler, Mass.	Pritchard	Winn
Helstoski	Quie	Wolff
Hicks	Rangel	Wright
Hillis	Rees	Wydler
Holt	Regula	Wylie
Holtzman	Reuss	Yates
Howard	Riegle	Young, Alaska
Hunt	Rinaldo	Young, Fla.
Johnson, Colo.	Rodino	Young, Ga.
Jones, Ala.	Roe	Young, Ill.
Jones, Okla.	Roncalio, Wyo.	Zwach

NOES—207

Alexander	Crane	Hastings
Anderson, Calif.	Cronin	Henderson
	Daniel, Dan	Hinshaw
Andrews, N.C.	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hogan
Archer		Holifield
Arends	Danielson	Horton
Ashley	Davis, Ga.	Hosmer
Baker	Davis, S.C.	Huber
Barrett	Davis, Wis.	Hungate
Beard	de la Garza	Hutchinson
Bevill	Dellenback	Ichord
Blackburn	Dennis	Jarman
Boggs	Derwinski	Johnson, Calif.
Boland	Dickinson	Johnson, Pa.
Bolling	Donohue	Jones, N.C.
Bowen	Downing	Jones, Tenn.
Bray	Duncan	King
Breaux	Eilberg	Landgrebe
Breckinridge	Erlenborn	Landrum
Brooks	Eshleman	Latta
Broomfield	Evins, Tenn.	Lent
Brown, Mich.	Fisher	Litton
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Long, La.
Broyhill, Va.	Flowers	Lujan
Buchanan	Flynt	McClory
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	McCormack
Burke, Mass.	Frelinghuysen	McDade
Burleson, Tex.	Frey	McEwen
Burlison, Mo.	Froehlich	McFall
Butler	Fuqua	McKay
Byron	Gaydos	McSpadden
Carter	Gibbons	Macdonald
Casey, Tex.	Ginn	Madden
Cederberg	Gonzalez	Madigan
Chamberlain	Gray	Mahon
Chappell	Green, Oreg.	Mallary
Clancy	Griffiths	Mann
Clawson, Del	Grover	Maraziti
Cleveland	Hamilton	Martin, Nebr.
Collier	Hammer-schmidt	Mayne
Collins, Tex.		Michel
Conable	Hanley	Miller
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Mills
Cotter	Hansen, Wash.	Minshall, Ohio
Coughlin	Harsha	Mitchell, N.Y.

Montgomery	Rooney, Pa.	Thornton
Morgan	Runnels	Tiernan
Mosher	Ruppe	Treen
Natcher	Ruth	Ullman
Nichols	St Germain	Vander Jagt
Nix	Satterfield	Veysey
O'Neill	Scherle	Waggonner
Parris	Schneebeli	Walsh
Passman	Shipley	Wampler
Patten	Sikes	Ware
Pepper	Slack	White
Perkins	Snyder	Whitehurst
Peyser	Spence	Whitten
Poage	Staggers	Wiggins
Powell, Ohio	Steed	Williams
Preyer	Steiger, Ariz.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Price, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.	
Price, Tex.	Stephens	
Quillen	Stratton	Wyatt
Railsback	Stuckey	Wyman
Randall	Sullivan	Yatron
Rarick	Symington	Young, S.C.
Rhodes	Talcott	Young, Tex.
Robinson, Va.	Taylor, N.C.	Zablocki
Robison, N.Y.	Teague	Zion
Rogers	Thomson, Wis.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bell

NOT VOTING—35

Anderson, Ill.	Fulton	Myers
Aspin	Giaimo	O'Brien
Bafalis	Goldwater	Patman
Blatnik	Gubser	Pickle
Brown, Calif.	Haley	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Roberts
Devine	Heinz	Roncallo, N.Y.
Diggs	Hudnut	Rooney, N.Y.
Dingell	Kazen	Rose
Dorn	Milford	Stokes
Findley	Mollohan	Stubblefield
Fraser	Murphy, Ill.	

So the amendments were rejected.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BUCHANAN was allowed to proceed out of order.)

SUIT FILED AGAINST U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inform the House that I filed suit today in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama against the U.S. Postal Service for myself and as a class action suit on behalf of people across the United States who will in my judgment be adversely affected by decisions involving a further decline in services without the Postal Service having gone through the review and hearing procedures prescribed by law in the Postal Reorganization Act.

One of these changes involves the relocation and reduction of facilities in 25 cities across the Nation, one of which is Birmingham, Ala. It is my understanding that the Postal Service has yet to notify these cities of their good fortune, so I will, as a public service, publish this information which I have just received from the Postal Service. The cities are:

Birmingham, Alabama.
Flushing, New York.
Oakland, California.
San Francisco, California.
Miami, Florida.
Houston, Texas.
Raleigh/Durham, North Carolina.
Tulsa, Oklahoma.
Atlanta, Georgia.
Seattle, Washington.
Colorado Springs, Colorado.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
St. Louis, Missouri.
Dallas, Texas.
Des Moines, Iowa.
Amarillo, Texas.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Knoxville, Tennessee.
Denver, Colorado.
Detroit, Michigan.
Mobile, Alabama.
Peoria, Illinois.
Fort Worth, Texas.
Lubbock, Texas.
Kansas City, Missouri.

The second change involves some 86 cities in which postal districts will be consolidated. Again Birmingham is among the chosen. Although I have requested information concerning the remaining districts, it has not been forthcoming. I have therefore filed suit seeking injunctive relief until the review required by law is completed and hearings are held by the Postal Rate Commission, as required by law. I hope we can strike a blow for freedom in this suit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. HAMILTON) Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14434) making appropriations for energy research and development activities of certain departments, independent executive agencies, bureaus, offices, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 4, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—392

Abzug	Bevill	Burgener
Adams	Biaggi	Burke, Calif.
Addabbo	Biester	Burke, Fla.
Alexander	Bingham	Burke, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Blackburn	Burleson, Tex.
	Boggs	Burlison, Mo.
Andrews, N.C.	Boland	Burton
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bolling	Butler
	Bowen	Byron
Annunzio	Brademas	Camp
Archer	Brasco	Carney, Ohio
Arends	Bray	Carter
Armstrong	Breaux	Casey, Tex.
Ashbrook	Breckinridge	Cederberg
Ashley	Brinkley	Chamberlain
Badillo	Brooks	Chappell
Baker	Broomfield	Chisholm
Barrett	Brotzman	Clancy
Bauman	Brown, Mich.	Clark
Beard	Brown, Ohio	Clausen, Don H.
Bell	Broyhill, N.C.	
Bennett	Broyhill, Va.	Clawson, Del
Bergland	Buchanan	Clay
Cleveland	Horton	Price, Ill.
Cochran	Hosmer	Price, Tex.
Cohen	Howard	Pritchard
Collier	Huber	Quie
Collins, Ill.	Hungate	Quillen
Collins, Tex.	Hunt	Railsback
Conable	Hutchinson	Randall
Conlan	Ichord	Rangel
Conte	Jarman	Rarick
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Rees
Corman	Johnson, Colo.	Regula
Cotter	Johnson, Pa.	Reuss
Coughlin	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Cronin	Jones, N.C.	Riegle
Culver	Jones, Okla.	Rinaldo
Daniel, Dan	Jones, Tenn.	Robinson, Va.
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Jordan	Robison, N.Y.
	Karth	Rodino
Daniels, Dominick V.	Kastenmeier	Roe
	Kemp	Rogers
Danielson	Ketchum	Roncalio, Wyo.
Davis, Ga.	King	Rooney, Pa.
Davis, S.C.	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Davis, Wis.	Koch	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Roush
Delaney	Kyros	Rousselot
Dellenback	Lagomarsino	Roy
Dellums	Landrum	Roybal
Denholm	Latta	Runnels
Dennis	Leggett	Ruppe
Dent	Lehman	Ruth
Derwinski	Lent	Ryan
Dickinson	Litton	St Germain
Donohue	Long, La.	Sandman
Downing	Long, Md.	Sarasin
Drinan	Lott	Sarbanes
Dulski	Lujan	Satterfield
Duncan	Luken	Scherle
du Pont	McClory	Schneebeli
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Schroeder
Edwards, Ala.	McCormack	Sebelius
Edwards, Calif.	McDade	Seiberling
Eilberg	McEwen	Shipley
Erlenborn	McFall	Shoup
Esch	McKay	Shriver
Eshleman	McKinney	Shuster
Evans, Colo.	McSpadden	Sikes
Evins, Tenn.	Macdonald	Sisk
Fascell	Madden	Skubitz
Fish	Madigan	Slack
Fisher	Mallary	Smith, Iowa
Flood	Mann	Smith, N.Y.
Flowers	Maraziti	Snyder
Flynt	Martin, Nebr.	Spence
Foley	Martin, N.C.	Staggers
Ford	Mathias, Calif.	Stanton, J. William
Forsythe	Mathis, Ga.	
Fountain	Matsunaga	Stanton, James V.
Frelinghuysen	Mayne	
Frenzel	Mazzoli	Stark
Frey	Meeds	Steed
Froehlich	Melcher	Steele
Fuqua	Metcalfe	Steelman
Gaydos	Mezvinsky	Steiger, Ariz.
Gettys	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Gibbons	Miller	Stephens
Gilman	Mills	Stratton
Ginn	Minish	Stuckey
Gonzalez	Mink	Studds
Goodling	Minshall, Ohio	Sullivan
Grasso	Mitchell, Md.	Symington
Gray	Mitchell, N.Y.	Talcott
Green, Oreg.	Mizell	Taylor, Mo.
Green, Pa.	Moakley	Taylor, N.C.
Griffiths	Montgomery	Teague
Grover	Moorhead, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Gude		Thomson, Wis.
Gunter	Moorhead, Pa.	Thone
Guyer	Morgan	Thornton
Hamilton	Mosher	Tiernan
Hammer-schmidt	Moss	Towell, Nev.
	Murphy, N.Y.	Traxler
Hanley	Murtha	Treen
Hanna	Natcher	Udall
Hanrahan	Nedzi	Ullman
Hansen, Idaho	Nelsen	Van Deerlin
Hansen, Wash.	Nichols	Vander Jagt
Harrington	Nix	Vander Veen
Harsha	Obey	Vanik
Hastings	O'Hara	Veysey
Hawkins	O'Neill	Vigorito
Hays	Owens	Waggonner
Hébert	Parris	Waldie
Hechler, W. Va.	Passman	Walsh
Heckler, Mass.	Patten	Wampler
Helstoski	Pepper	Ware
Henderson	Perkins	Whalen
Hicks	Pettis	White
Hillis	Peyser	Whitehurst
Hinshaw	Pike	Whitten
Hogan	Poage	Widnall
Holifield	Podell	Wiggins
Holt	Powell, Ohio	Williams
Holtzman	Preyer	Wilson, Bob

Wilson, Charles H., Calif.	Wyatt	Young, Ga.
	Wydler	Young, Ill.
	Wylie	Young, S.C.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.	Wyman	Young, Tex.
	Yates	Zablocki
Winn	Yatron	Zion
Wolff	Young, Alaska	Zwach
Wright	Young, Fla.	

NAYS—4

Crane	Landgrebe	Symms
Gross		

NOT VOTING—37

Abdnor	Fulton	Myers
Anderson, Ill.	Giaimo	O'Brien
Aspin	Goldwater	Patman
Bafalis	Gubser	Pickle
Blatnik	Haley	Reid
Brown, Calif.	Heinz	Roberts
Carey, N.Y.	Hudnut	Roncallo, N.Y.
Devine	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
Diggs	McCollister	Rose
Dingell	Mahon	Stokes
Dorn	Milford	Stubblefield
Findley	Mollohan	
Fraser	Murphy, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Abdnor.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Kazen with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. McCollister.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Milford with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. O'Brien.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tables and extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S PROCEDURE FOR SUPPLYING INFORMATION TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the President for the procedure he has adopted for supplying information to the House Judiciary Committee in accordance with its subpena. He will provide transcripts to the committee and will be following the rules of confidentiality of the House Judiciary Committee in that he will permit the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee to listen to the tapes for purposes of verification. The only exceptions to the committee's own rules which was adopted on February 22, 1974, are: First, the transcripts are being furnished in the first instance to the members of the committee and are being made public. Under the committee's rules, this would not have been possible until after the chairman, the ranking member, and the staff had gone over the information and recommended the material to be presented for the other committee members consideration under rule No. 3 of the procedures adopted on February 22, 1974; second, the two staff members given the privilege of listening to tapes under the committee's rules were not included under the President's procedure. I find this omission not of great importance as the American people will prefer having their elected representatives listening to these tapes and if any person is to be denied the opportunity of listening to a tape it should be the hired staff and not the elected representative of the people.

The Committee on the Judiciary has had tapes under its control for some time now and, under the rules adopted by the committee, the only members of the committee permitted to listen to these tapes are the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON). As a member of the committee, if I wanted to go over there right now and listen to one of those tapes, I would be denied that right under the committee's own rules.

So what the President of the United States was saying last night was that he was going to adhere to the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary with the exceptions I have noted, and I commend the President for taking this action. I wish he had taken this step months ago.

THE HOUSE NEEDS AN URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that in its long deliberations the Select Committee on Committees failed to deal with the overwhelming problems of America's major cities. Consequently, when the committee reform bill is reported to the full House of Representatives, I will offer an amendment to create a standing Committee on Urban Affairs.

This proposal stems from my conviction that the urban crisis in this country is not being met in any meaningful way by the Congress or any of its committees. I see no coordinated approach to urban problems under the new committee alinement drafted by the House Select Committee on Committees with the intention of modernizing the operations of the House.

The purpose of the committee reform amendments is to eliminate overlapping jurisdictions and to adjust our congressional work to the realities of the times. But even if the proposed amendments are approved, a mayor or other metropolitan spokesman who wishes to meet with the appropriate Congressmen on matters of concern to his city will have to continue to address his pleas to half a dozen or more committees under the reform plan, while the rural official with a problem can get comprehensive consideration of the problems of his constituents through one committee alone—the Committee on Agriculture.

The deterioration of America's inner cities requires a coordinated remedial approach. This will not happen in the U.S. Congress unless a committee is established to be the focal point for urban concerns and carry the fight for urgently needed programs to help the cities.

Our great cities, the economic and cultural centers of the Nation, are falling into decay because of the absence of a national commitment to attack their problems. With the flight of the articulate and affluent to the suburbs, political power and the focus of legislation have fled with them. The fact that no housing bill is pending in the House of Representatives today, with all Federal housing programs expiring on June 30, is a prime example of this absence of congressional focus.

Housing, although it is not strictly an urban issue, is only one example of the misordered priorities in areas where urban dwellers have an important stake. Legislation affecting urban areas has in the past years been defeated, amended, or blocked until the beneficial effects have been destroyed. One example of the disjointed and prejudicial treatment of urban problems appeared in the deliberation on mass transit this year. Under a contingency gas rationing plan formulated in January, New York City and other urban jurisdictions were slated to get 20 percent less gas than other areas of the country because of the availability of extensive mass transit systems. Yet a few short months later, when the Minish-Williams mass transit bill was brought to the Rules Committee, it was blocked because it allocated major portions of its funds to cities with developed mass transit systems.

Other examples of this double standard for legislative priorities abound but I believe that it is clear that a permanent committee with urban Congressmen dealing daily with urban matters is a first step toward reorienting our Nation's priorities. Under the amendment I will propose, all housing programs, urban mass transportation, relocation assistance, urban development, and oversight over all Government laws and programs with a substantial impact on the cities will be under the jurisdiction of a House Urban Affairs Committee. I also have made provision for regional planning of urban affairs, including matters of mutual concern to nearby cities, or to cities and their suburban neighbors, that can best be handled by cooperation across jurisdictional lines.

For example, the inclusion of urban mass transportation under an Urban Affairs Committee is necessary because of the historic failure of Congress to consider mass transit as an integral part of a national transportation system. The select committee proposes that responsibility for urban mass transit reside in a new Public Works and Transportation Committee, but that body will undoubtedly reflect much of the present composition of the Public Works Com-

mittee which is dominated by Congressmen from rural areas who are unfamiliar with urban mass transit problems. With the continuing energy shortages, and with the ever-present pollution caused by America's massive commuting pattern, we should have long ago spurred the development of public mass transit systems around the Nation—a default which I believe can be best remedied now by a committee with experience, expertise, and a sense of urgency.

It will be argued that problems of great magnitude in inner cities—housing, drugs, unemployment, crime, poor schools—are not uniquely urban. I agree that to some extent these issues cut across congressional district lines. But these problems are of greater intensity in center cities and require immediate and knowledgeable consideration in the Congress.

But a further argument must be advanced in considering current reform proposals. Under these proposals, many subject areas are assigned to standing committees that are multijurisdictional as well, with a recommendation for a new system of multiple referrals and consecutive referrals of bills. Such a system means that more than one committee will contribute to the drafting of some legislation prior to action in the full House. Such an arrangement will only lead to jurisdictional disputes that can only continue to undermine the need for responsive action by the House.

While the purpose of committee reform is to adjust our congressional work to the realities of the times, some will argue that committee reform should be a streamlining process, not an additive one. But avoiding a committee dealing with the specific and most pressing problems of our urban areas will not adjust congressional work to those needs, and consolidating the number of committees will only serve to concentrate power in the House rather than meeting the committed goal of dispersal of responsibility among more Members of the House.

Almost 69 percent of our population currently lives in our Nation's 243 metropolitan areas, 31 percent in our central cities. They deserve the attention and consideration that the rest of our population currently receives. My proposal seeks to create a mechanism for bringing the urban crisis to the forefront of the country's attention and to develop public support for making our cities once again enjoyable and stimulating places in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my amendment follows:

Page 20, after line 6, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

"(u) Committee on Urban Affairs, the legislative jurisdiction of which shall include—

"(1) Public and private housing.

"(2) Urban development.

"(3) Urban mass transportation.

"(4) Relocation assistance.

"(5) Regional planning for urban affairs, including environmental protection, economic development, residential patterns, and other matters which have a related or simultaneous impact on a large metropolitan center and adjoining suburbs or nearby cities and towns."

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight functions under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the special oversight functions provided for in clause 3(g) with respect to urban planning and the impact of government programs on major urban centers.

Page 5, line 1, strike out "Banking, Currency, and Housing" and insert in lieu thereof "Banking and Currency".

Page 5, strike out lines 9 and 10 (and redesignate the succeeding subparagraphs accordingly).

Page 16, line 16, strike out "urban mass transportation,".

Page 16, strike out line 20 (and redesignate the succeeding subparagraphs accordingly).

Page 25, add a new section beginning on line 17:

"(g) The Committee on Urban Affairs shall have the function of reviewing and studying, on a continuing basis, all laws, programs, and Government activities having a substantial impact on major urban centers.

PRESENT INACTION ON CONTROL AUTHORITY WILL BE REGRETTED IN THE MONTHS AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, today, April 30, marks the end of the Economic Stabilization Act which authorizes wage and price controls. Some will regard this as a day of rejoicing that this is the end of all controls. Others may take no particular note of the event but regard it simply as the last day of April. Still others may on this last day of controls begin to view with genuine apprehension just what may or will happen in the months ahead without controls.

For my part I prefer to be classified in the latter category. I am greatly concerned as to what may happen in the months ahead. Inflation may very well take off in a gallop with strides like we have not heretofore experienced. Of course we hope and pray this will not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that today I have introduced two bills which hopefully may be considered by the appropriate committees in the not-too-distant future. Because bill numbers have not yet been assigned, as I make these remarks I must therefore refer to these two measures as the first bill and/or the second bill.

The proposals in my first bill are as follows: all prices and interest rates will be frozen as of the January 1, 1974, level. In the area of wages and salaries, when the Consumer Price Index exceeds a 3-percent annual rate for 3 consecutive months or a 2½-percent annual rate for 12 consecutive months, wages may, but not necessarily shall, be frozen at the January 2, 1974, level. It is proposed that rents shall be frozen at the January 2, 1974, level but permitted to increase by exactly the amount of increased taxes or amortization of capital improvements.

My first bill will provide a measure of control over commodity speculation and until other legislation is passed and signed into law such shall be administered by the Federal Reserve System. Until other consumer legislation is fully enacted and signed into law, my first bill would create an Office of Consumer Counsellor to provide consumer guidance and information. In my first bill the General Accounting Office would review and publicize reports concerning prices, profits, wages, interest rates, and rents. All reporting requirements shall provide that the reports be made public. The following reports are required to be published: productivity and compensation; consumer prices; wholesale prices; corporate earnings; interest rates; average hourly earnings; statistics on employment and unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I announce that I have today introduced a second bill which might at first inspection seem to be inconsistent or going in a different direction from my first bill. However, such is not the case. My objective on this last day is to take some action that may lead to some hearings and hopefully some action that will stem the rush of inflation. My second bill provides for continuing to monitor the various decontrol agreements made between business and the Cost of Living Council. It provides for a review of all industries in the area of production capacity, product demand, labor matters, and wages paid. It directs the President to hold hearings and take such other steps as are needed to focus attention on the need for increased productivity and to require reports from all sectors of the economy.

Perhaps the most important provision of this second bill is the fact that it directs the President to conduct an intensive and long-term study of inflation, its causes, and recommendations for its control and to publicize the results.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have great pride of authorship of either of these measures. They are drafted very hurriedly. Perhaps there are some dates which should be changed or amended. Certainly I shall not stop my efforts with the introduction of these two bills.

One reason that I decided to act decisively and do something is the fact that it seems that so very few on our side of the Congress are inclined to do anything. Ther have been many times that I have not been one of the foremost cheerleaders of our colleagues on the north side of the Capitol. But at the present moment they seem to be the only ones who are doing anything about any kind of legislation to control inflation. For my part I salute them and wish them well and truly hope that they can set an example that will be followed on our side of the Capitol dome. I repeat that there may be those in the House who are not concerned at the present moment over the expiration of controls. But I make the solemn prediction that with the passage of 60 to 90 or perhaps 120 days they will become greatly concerned. But the time to do something is not at the end of the summer but now.

HEARING ON SOARING FOOD PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while in my district during the Easter recess, I conducted a day-long public hearing on soaring food costs and their effects on the lives of my constituents in the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Since Congress reconvened last week I have been submitting to the RECORD the dramatic and informative testimonies heard at the food hearing which was held in Natick on April 18. Each witness explained how inflationary food costs have adversely affected their individual lives and the businesses or organizations they represented.

I have learned a great deal from the statements made during this hearing by food retailers, distributors, representatives of consumer organizations, the elderly, those on welfare, and hospital and school directors of food service departments.

Today I am submitting two additional statements for the RECORD so that my colleagues in the House may also benefit from the information I received:

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. BELL, DIRECTOR OF FOOD SERVICES FOR NATICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Doctor Gail Cosgrove, the school committee chairman, asked me to testify and he wants you to know that the school committee is very concerned about the rise in food cost. In the May 21st issue of the Community Nutrition Institute Weekly, the headline story was "Signs Point to Watch Bread Decline in School Lunch Program." One of the causes that they list is the rising cost of food.

They state, and I want to quote this, "The steady upward climb of wholesale food costs suggest the meals served in public schools are going to rise substantially in price in the years ahead. Accompanying the rise in food cost have been a decline in donated commodities which USDA wants to replace with cash payments. Higher school prices will inevitably lead to fewer paying children, and thus, to lower participation overall. A leveling off in Federal financial support will lead to a halt in the expansion of free and reduced price lunches.

It is estimated that every time the price of a school lunch is raised five cents we lose five per cent of the participation. When the Natick schools have had to raise prices on the lunch five cents twice in the past two years and the participation in both years in the Coolidge Junior High School and the high school has declined. Both of these schools have had an increase in enrollment each year. And I'd just like to quote you these figures; these are cumulative figures through November of each year. At Coolidge Junior High School in 1971, we served 22,654 meals, in '72 we served 21,140 and in 1973 we served 20,597. Now, that was a loss of nine per cent. In high school, it ran 67,660, 64,148, and 50,-074, which was a loss of fourteen per cent. Now in the high school, I think the advent of the open campus had some adverse effect on the participation. However, it shows definitely that there is a loss of participation. Why has the cost of food hurt participation? There's an old and very true axiom, if you want to increase your participation, upgrade the menu.

This holds not only for the school lunch program, but for any food service operation. What we've had to do is not upgrade our menu, but rather substitute lower price foods for ones which the children have come to know and like. Certainly, we do not and can not serve steak, but such things as pastrami, an occasional tuna salad, or a roast beef sandwich have had to be replaced by egg salad or more hamburger or preproportioned meats.

We've had to use protein substitutes which maintain the type "A" pattern which though nutritious and good for the children are not pleasing to many palates. Of course, then, we have menu fatigue because they become repetitious. The worst part in the loss of participation is not that we're not getting as many kids to eat because that's a numbers game that I don't really care to play, but it's the section of the student population that we're losing that can least afford to pay. They do not qualify for free lunch and cannot afford to give up the forty cents for each child for each meal for each day. Or, they don't want to be classified as welfare recipients and would rather have their children go without, than to be so designated. And mom usually has a jar of peanut butter and jelly that she sends them off with a sandwich. But this doesn't provide a child with what he really needs and that's a well balanced meal every day at noontime.

Again, I'd like to quote the C.N.I. weekly report of August 16, when it was reported that the Senate Nutrition Committee poll shows school boards across the country are adjusting to rising costs by raising prices of school lunches by five to ten per cent. Committee aides fear that this development may aid to drive out of the program the near poor, those children whose families are not eligible for free lunches, but cannot afford the extra nickel or dime a day. Such development will accelerate trends to declining participation and fewer paid lunches. In Michigan, where the school lunch price will probably go up a nickel, the hike is being taken reluctantly. Now this is a quote, "When you raise prices you take a chance of defeating the whole purpose of the program," Jim Borrow, the state director, told C.N.I. I think one of the underlying purposes that does not legally show itself is the fact that we're trying to teach the children, at least in somewhat of a passive manner, what a good meal should contain. In other words, we're trying to give them some nutrition education. This is not possible if the child does not participate in the program. And, it's a known fact, it's a proven fact, that children learn better if they have something in their stomach. As Director of Food Services of the Natick schools, I'm concerned more and more with spiraling costs of food. The effects are many and seem to compound themselves. For example, the fewer the commodities purchased with the funds allotted, the more we have to buy at street prices. And the more we have to buy at street prices, the greater is the cost to the child.

STATEMENT OF KEN MULLEN, OWNER OF HAZEL'S BAKERY, WELLESLEY, MASS.

I am also a vice president of the Massachusetts Retail Bakers Association and I think that I am a typical member of the association, so I am going to report from my own personal business and I feel that it's very typical across the complete association of three hundred bakers, certainly very similar to the fifteen hundred of Mr. Sands' services.

I am a retail baker operating a forty year old family business I recently bought from my father. During the years previous to my ownership of this business, they employed an average of fifteen people and supplied my father with what I would consider a higher middle class income. From the time of my ownership in January of 1972 to April of 1973, the business grew to the point where it could support twenty employees and continue to give my father a retired income and support my family on a middle class basis. The business was also able to build enough capital to purchase a second bakery now known as Hazel's in Westwood. Because I have no records of previous sales in this location, percentages in this testimony will refer only to my Wellesley shop. Since April of '73, the business still employs twenty people and still gives my father and myself the same income. But there is no capital to reinvest in the business in the way of some much needed new equipment and another location. My employees have not had a raise during this period. When you look from their side of the picture with the increased cost of living, they are well overdue for a raise. High prices of raw materials and shortages have slowed the growth trend of my business because the consumer is not able, or does not have the desire to pay my higher prices. In support of this I refer to the comparison Mr. Sands (testimony submitted to the record on April 25) made on flour. My bakery products have gone up on an average of 20 percent. This does not cover my new ingredient cost but it seems to be all the customer can bear. This is proven by the fact that my dollar volume has dropped 2 percent. When you take into consideration my prices are up 20 percent, this means my production is down 22 percent.

Note that I have kept all my employees working. I have been forced to take on a wholesale stock which shows no profit. My customer reaction to the price increase has been a lot less verbal than in past years when we've had to increase prices. With all the publicity of food price increases they seem to expect it and accept it quietly. Of course, my dollar volume shows that they are not buying as much of my type of product, except on the important events such as holidays and birthday business, and I think this shows it and it almost has pushed me into a luxury item.

I firmly believe in our nation's business system of supply and demand, and I believe the farmer has the ingenuity and the technology to produce more out of his land and consequently when he can meet this new world market we will have a reverse trend. I'm sure we will never stop paying $7.00 for a bag of flour which we're paying $15.00 for now, in the past we have paid $7.00, $7.95.

I think controls are necessary now because the farmer is just not ready to feed the world and whether or not the United States farmer can feed the world, I don't know. But they've come to the right country if there is a farmer that can do it—I think it's our farmers. Until they gear up I'm afraid we do need some controls and I certainly do believe that when the farmer can sell a bushel of wheat for six dollars, he's going to make more wheat.

I think that it's important to realize that these new countries which can now live at our levels, for example, Japan—a Japanese baker over there producing let's say, a raisin cookie, has absolutely no guidelines on his prices. Maybe his customers have never bought a raisin cookie, but I have an established tradition on my prices and consequently he can come over to this country or his distributors can come and buy the raisin product and they really don't care what they pay for it because the customer is not knowledgeable on what a raisin cookie costs in the United States. But when I compete with that man, the Japanese baker, in the market place for raisins and he pushes my price up to now what is 63 cents—my customers cannot understand this increased cost and his customer doesn't know.

NEW YORK STATE COMPTROLLER ARTHUR LEVITT'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE 30TH ANNUAL ERIE COUNTY MASONIC SUNDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1974, following church services at the Episcopal Church of the Ascension and Temple Beth Zion in Buffalo, those in attendance at the 30th Annual Erie County Masonic Sunday had the high honor and profound privilege of hearing New York State Comptroller and our Brother Mason, Arthur Levitt, speak about the inspiration and direction of our Nation and its people.

Another honored guest at this inspirational event was my good friend, the Most Worshipful Lloyd S. Cochran, grand master of Masons in the State of New York, a member of the First Baptist Church of Lockport, and a distinguished and dynamic leader of our craft in New York.

The chairman of this outstanding event was Bernard W. Woodward who, with skill and tireless effort, made the day a memorable event in Erie County Masonic history.

Introduced by another cherished friend, Mike Ellis, Comptroller Levitt delivered an address which was overwhelming in its beauty.

He spoke not only to us who are Masons that morning, but to all good men who care about their God, their country and their fellow men. He said:

The true destiny of America is the destiny of the smallest town within her borders, the desire to live peacefully, to work honorably, to worship according to conscience and to prosper according to merit.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in the political arena feel that the sense of community and citizen involvement which has guided our Nation for nearly two centuries is on the verge of being lost, perhaps on the verge of being preempted by the Government.

Arthur Levitt's words are telling:

I am particularly concerned with the vitality of our community life because I see some danger that we are increasingly turning civic activity over to the State. With every increase in governmental budget comes an increase in state participation in social causes. I do not think that our democracy is strengthened when this happens. The causes, themselves, are worthy, but we do not need more bureaucracy. We need citizen involvement.

I know that many of my colleagues in this chamber, in their desire to instill, particularly in the young people of our districts, a sense of urgency to the need for citizen involvement, will reaffirm the insight of Mr. Levitt's remarks:

It is indeed evil to stand still and do nothing, for we waste the precious gift of mind, of spirit, of freedom. We become parasites on those who care enough to serve humanity; we are not builders in the tradition of our ancient craft, but despoilers. If we are really to have both persuasion and purpose, may we never stand still for long.

Many of us had the exceeding good fortune to hear Comptroller Levitt's remarks. To those who did not, I include them in the RECORD. The cogency, the wisdom, the urgency and the eloquence speak for themselves.

The address follows:

(Address by State Comptroller Arthur Levitt, at the annual Masonic breakfast, April 28, 1974, Hotel Statler Hilton, Buffalo, N.Y.)

PERSUASION AND PURPOSE

There is a special reason I am happy, even relieved, to be your speaker this morning. Eight years ago I gave the address at the annual banquet of the Buffalo Consistory, in this very room. And for eight long years I didn't hear from the Buffalo Masons again.

So I was sure that you had written off all comptrollers from your guest list.

So it was a great pleasure three months ago to receive your invitation through Brother Ellis. And there are other reasons I am glad to be back in Buffalo.

It was here that I received my second nomination for public office; and here that I have met with so many civic and business organizations on questions of public finance.

I am thankful that we are not meeting this morning on any question of public affairs. You did not invite me here because you want more state money, or because you want to condemn high taxes or the energy shortage or water pollution; important as these subjects may be.

And as I look around this ballroom, there are no signs of the usual conference. There are no tables set up for panel discussions, no visual aids, no side rooms for group seminars, and no exhibits of what is supposed to be right or wrong.

No, you are not meeting to spend somebody else's money, or to condemn somebody else's program.

We have had breakfast together, and we meet together, to further the cause of universal fraternity, of brotherhood, of fellowship.

And earlier this morning we drew spiritual strength from the wellspring of all that we may accomplish in life—our common belief in the one great Architect, through whom there is all light, meaning and power.

Here this morning, in this spirit, is the soul of our great fraternity. And here this morning, in this goodwill, is the answer to every critic of American society.

To be sure, we meet in troubled times—extending to our own fraternity. I do not speak here of any worry about total membership. This is not so important, in my opinion, as some would have us believe. If we have learned anything in our American life of recent years, it is just this: Success is no longer measured by growth in quantity. Rather, success should be measured by the way we improve the quality of life. And so it is with Masonry.

In short, the important thing is that we have persuasion and purpose in whatever we do. It is on this theme that I would speak this morning.

THE MEANING OF "PERSUASION"

The word I used a moment ago—persuasion—is found in a Masonic document some 240 years old. I refer to Anderson's Book of Constitutions, published in England long before we became a nation. In a moment I shall quote from it, but please note that this ancient text had nothing to do with ritual or secrecy much as it has a familiar ring. Rather, it expressed universal moral law, with deep spiritual conviction. Here, then, is what Anderson's book of Constitutions proclaimed:

"A Mason is oblig'd, by his tenure, to obey the moral law; and if he rightly understands the art, he will never be a stupid atheist, nor an irreligious libertine. . .

" 'Tis now thought more expedient only to oblige Masons to that religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves; that is, to be good men and true, or men of honour and honesty, by whatever denominations or persuasions they may be distinguished."

It is in this manner, and in these beliefs, that we find a common fellowship in our fraternity—each according to his own persuasion, but the word "persuasion" means more than mere acceptance. The word was used in the first "Book of Constitutions" when to be a man of God was to risk life itself for a cause; and when to be a good Mason, whether operative or speculative, was to be a builder for mankind.

It is precisely in these two areas—in spiritual affairs and in public affairs—that we need strengthening today if we want to achieve the better society we proclaim. "Dedicate" means to declare, according to the Latin derivation. We best declare our beliefs by the witness we give to others.

Now I am not about to urge you to desert home and family for church or synagogue, nor am I about to urge you to resign from business for political action. I am not going to ask you to become involved in a variety of causes and community programs. Many of you are already involved too much. And this is just the point. We waste the impact of our efforts because we lack economy of direction.

This morning, then, we think back on that old Book of Constitutions and its simple precept that we be "good men and true, and men of honor and honesty." How do we really achieve this in the mad competition, in the multiple demands and the impossible schedules, of the modern world? We do it, I submit, by economy of direction—which really means honesty of purpose.

We do not do it at the expense of health or family; on the contrary, we improve both by the inner well-being which springs from meaningful effort. And there is a valuable by-product: the right use of leisure, something which is slowly vanishing from American life.

When a man is a witness for his beliefs, a contributor to his community, he needs no artificial stimulants for his leisure time. He will know what the ancient philosophers referred to as contemplation and contentment. He will rediscover the wonder of his own mind.

Today, the expanding frontiers of our knowledge reveal the limitless wonders of creation. But in all the universe the human mind finds no wonder as great as the mind itself, no mystery as deep as the human spirit. Through mind and spirit man reaches out to seek the true purpose, the true meaning of what we know as life. As our minds are enriched, as we are lifted up in spirit, so do we come nearer to a perception, however dim, of eternal truth. There is no greater knowledge.

Now I know that it is not intellectually fashionable in certain circles these days to speak of the spirit, the soul or even of things divine. The analyst can't measure them, the biologist can't dissect them, the lawyer can't put them on the witness stand. But some things will remain forever beyond the scope of the computer, or the laboratory, or the rules of evidence.

As the physical limits of the universe are pushed beyond millions of light years, so does the mystery of life, the wonder of creation, deepen. Thinking scientists bear witness to this today as readily as do theologians.

Now then, why should a speaker with a background in law and government be saying these things to you this morning?

My answer is that intellect and faith should be part of every walk of life. I go further and say to you that never before have we so needed in government men and women of intelligence, of faith and conviction, of vision and culture. A republic is truly representative only when it is responsible to all the interests, all the aspirations, of a free society. Here is the hope of America and here is your place in a viable age of challenge and opportunity.

THE MEANING OF "PURPOSE"

This brings us to the second area in which I urge your activity—the area of public service, speaking very generally. Here again, we

have an ancient precedent in the history of our craft.

Did you know that Masons, including three early Governors, were pioneers in establishing free education in public schools in the State of New York? They were truly builders for mankind, regardless of individual persuasions.

Our story begins one hundred sixty-five years ago, in the city of New York. At that time, there were no public schools as we know them today. Students paid for their education in private schools, or attended schools established by various religious groups. Our brethren of that day resolved to do something about it, the first idea being to establish a school under the auspices of the grand lodge. This would have been a free school for children of Masonic families.

We may be glad today that this first idea was eventually changed, because it would not truly have been in the spirit of our precepts. Our brethren would have been builders for fellow Masons, not for mankind.

A much better idea evolved.

Although a first school was opened in 1809 for the education of fifty children of poor Masons, in eight years this school was converted into a true public school under the supervision of the State. The support of the Masonic fraternity at that point ceased, but Masons had been instrumental in establishing the idea on which the common school was founded. It is a most noteworthy chapter in the history of our New York State lodges.

From these early beginnings, the interest of our fraternity in education has continued down to the present day. And there have been some very special contributions.

King Solomon Lodge in New York City established a permanent educational fund for post-graduate work.

Parish Lodge in Buffalo established an educational foundation in 1919.

Allegany County Masons established a free scholarship fund at Alfred University in 1940.

Other lodges throughout the State have contributed to endowment funds and their members have quietly helped deserving students complete their college educations.

And certainly we can take pride in the great amount of charitable work done by our Masonic bodies today.

But I would not have you think this morning that these events, these contributions, are the sum and substance of our search for light, nor the only way in which we must build for mankind. There is a higher meaning to which we must dedicate ourselves, to which all men must dedicate themselves, if the eventual temple of universal fraternity is to be built.

Education in this higher sense pervades all of our rituals, all of our interest in the square and compass of our actions. It is the total of our human experience.

You may recall the famous epigram of Albert Einstein, who defined education as "that which is left over, when we have forgotten everything we learned in school".

What we seek is direction in our search for light—guided by purpose, aware of our obligations to other men, and unwavering in our belief in the supreme design of life.

But if we are to adhere to purpose, we must first cleanse our minds of the clutter of other things.

Do you remember the story of the old prospector out west, whose food was so bad that he became thinner and thinner? A friend stopped by one day and said: "Why don't you get yourself a decent cookbook"? "Can't use a cookbook", the prospector replied, "every recipe starts by saying: "First, take a clean dish".

There is a point for us in the anecdote. Every challenge of life requires that we first have an open mind. And we may be proud that so many Masons in our history have had open minds, eager and willing minds, to be builders of America in every walk of life.

Today the challenges were never greater. And looking beyond our own fraternity, we find that much of the work of our society is done by many fine organizations throughout the Nation.

I refer to all of the civic groups in hundreds of our cities, thousands of our villages, and more thousands of our towns all across the face of America, each vibrant with group after group of spirited citizens.

The true destiny of America is the destiny of the smallest town within her borders—the desire to live peacefully, to work honorably, to worship according to conscience, and to prosper according to merit. I think our young people have been desperately trying to remind us of these basic goals in life.

I am particularly concerned with the vitality of our community life because I see some danger that we are increasingly turning civic activities over to the State. With every increase in governmental budgets comes an increase in State participation in social causes. I do not think that our democracy is strengthened when this happens.

The causes themselves are worthy, but we do not need more bureaucracy. We need citizen involvement.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the greatest weakness in our public life, in our education, even in our fraternal life, is that so many of us leave action to other people—we resist involvement.

And it reminds me of something written by Le Compte Du Nouy years ago in his work on "Human Destiny." It will serve well to bring together the two themes I have been stressing this morning.

The author was a French scientist who grew out of a purposeless life, out of an original agnosticism, into productive scholarship and a deep faith. His conversion was through science itself.

In the closing chapters of his great book, he dealt with the ancient problem of distinguishing good from evil, not in a moral sense but in an absolute sense. And he came to the conclusion that good is that which contributes to the continual progress of man upward from an animal existence, evil is that which pulls man backward from his progress, from his true destiny.

Then he added something, which I oversimplify, but it was to the effect that evil is also that which stands still and does nothing.

It is indeed evil to stand still and do nothing, for we waste the precious gift of mind, or spirit, of freedom. We become parasites on those who care enough to serve humanity; we are not builders in the tradition of our ancient craft, but despoilers. If we are really to have both persuasion and purpose, may we never stand still for long.

Those in attendance at the breakfast, whom I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, included:

Irving C. Tepas, past grand chaplain of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Sylvanus F. Nye, grand master, Grand Council Royal and Select Masters, State of New York.

Nelson H. Galster, grand representative of the Grand Lodge of Western Australia near the Grand Lodge of New York.

Gordon Lohman, grand director of ceremony of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Paul N. O'Neill, grand marshal of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Phillip B. Milliron, district deputy grand master, Third Erie District.

Edward G. Eschner, district deputy grand master, Second Erie District.

Albert H. Morgan, district deputy grand master, First Erie District.

Fred R. Sears, past junior grand warden of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Calvin G. Bond, past senior grand warden of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Bruce Widger, junior grand warden of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Albert E. Boxall, 33d commander-in-chief, Buffalo Consistory, Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite.

Angus A. MacKinnon, illustrious potentate, Ismailia Temple, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine.

Ralph Fraser, grand representative of the Grand Lodge of Vermont near the Grand Lodge of New York.

David S. Greenwood, grand representative of the Grand Lodge of California near the Grand Lodge of New York.

Osborne S. Stoddart, grand representative of the Grand Lodge of Arkansas near the Grand Lodge of New York.

C. Jerald Klemp, grand steward of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Alfred M. Zisser, grand sword bearer of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

J. Raymond Berg, grand standard bearer of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Frederick M. Marshall, justice of the supreme court and member of the Commission of Appeals of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Raymond D. Kurtz, trustee of the Masonic hall and asylum fund, past district deputy grand master, First Erie District.

Albert H. Hunt, past senior grand warden of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Albert W. Schneider, past senior grand warden of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Wendell K. Walker, grand secretary of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Frederick L. Stutz, senior grand warden of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York.

Charles F. Miller, president, Past District Deputies Association of Erie County, past district deputy, Second Erie District.

William Blumreich, Jr., cochairman of this breakfast, past district deputy grand master, First Erie District.

Richard Southard, president, National Sojourners, Buffalo Chapter No. 39.

Richard W. Hillman, eminent grand senior warden, Grand Commandary Knights Templar, State of New York.

Gregory B. Wildridge, representing brother Alfred G. Russert, monarch, Zuleika Grotto.

Robert E. MacPherson, president, Masonic Service Bureau.

Robert M. Fairchild, president, Erie County Masters Association.

George Freeberg, president, Erie County Wardens Association.

Irving Vogel, president, Past Masters Association of Erie County.

Wallace B. Fox, president, past grand lodge staff officers of Erie County.

James E. Bews, manager of the Masonic Service Bureau, past district deputy grand master, Third Erie District.

John A. Graci, assistant manager of the Masonic Service Bureau of Erie County.

Herman Knochenhauer, president, Erie County Masonic Foundation, past district deputy grand master, Third Erie District.

Lester H. Grawunder, member of this breakfast committee and parade marshal.

Louis E. McGee, member of this breakfast committee on police escort.

Emmett J. Selden, member of this breakfast committee on transportation, past commander of Lake Erie Commandery No. 20.

Sheldon K. Blank, chairman of the Masonic State Youth Committee of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York, past district deputy grand master, Oswego District.

Thomas A. Hughes, member of this breakfast committee on protocol, vice chairman, Grand Lodge Committee on Endowments, past district deputy grand master, First Erie District.

PANAMA CANAL: PAWN IN INTERNATIONAL POWER POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, among the issues of major significance now before the Congress are those relating to the Panama Canal.

The Member of Congress who for many years has been the recognized leader in bringing them into focus is our most distinguished and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD). His latest contribution was as the principal speaker on April 22, 1974, before a distinguished gathering at the National Aviation Club in Washington, D.C., of which Maj. Gen. Clifton F. Von Kann, U.S. Army, retired, is president, and Col. John P. Sigman, U.S. Marine Corps, retired was in charge of arrangements.

The guests included high officials from the following organizations: AFL–CIO, Air Transport Association of America, American Association of Port Authorities, American Institute of Merchant Shipping, American Legion, American Maritime Association, Committee for Constitutional Integrity, Masters, Mates and Pilots, AFL–CIO, Propeller Club of the United States, Radio Technological Commission for Aeronautics, U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, and U.S. Strategic Institute.

Mr. Speaker, the program was highly informative and should be of interest to all Members of Congress and the Nation at large. Accordingly, I quote the principal parts as follows:

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. VON KANN, INTRODUCING CONGRESSMAN FLOOD

Members of the National Aviation Club, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In May 1955, in connection with a treaty then being negotiated with the Republic of Panama, an attempt was made by certain elements in our government to liquidate the Panama Railroad. The member of the Congress most responsible for saving it is our speaker today. What is it in his background that enables him to address us with authority?

Born in Hazleton, Pennsylvania, on November 26, 1903, only 23 days after the secession of Panama from Colombia, he spent some of his earliest years in St. Augustine, Florida, where he learned to speak Spanish before he could talk in English. Other years of his boyhood were lived in Wilkes-Barre where former President Theodore Roosevelt was an occasional house guest at the home of our speaker's grandfather. Thus, the youngster had the unique privilege of hearing the dynamic T. R. himself explain how he launched the Panama Canal and some of his problems in doing it. That rich experience made a lasting impression causing Roosevelt to be his youthful ideal.

During his teens, our speaker spent some of his summers in Caribbean and Central American countries where his fluency in Spanish was a great asset. Many in those countries from Presidents down took an interest in teaching him local history, notably about interoceanic canals.

Majoring in history at Syracuse University where he won an M.A. degree, he then studied law at Harvard and Dickinson, obtained an LL.B. degree in 1929, and started upon an outstanding career that led to his first election in 1944 to the Congress.

In this body, as Vice Chairman of the Special Sub-Committee to investigate the murder by the Soviets of Polish Army Officer prisoners of war, 1951–52, and subsequently as leader of the Captive Nations Program, he has gained a profound insight into communist operations and practices. As a member of the Sub-Committee on Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations, he has attained a vast knowledge of National Defense, including Panama Canal history and problems.

Thus, after the 1955 treaty with Panama had weakened our Country's position on the Isthmus, his understanding of the hostile influences then converging on the Canal and knowledge of defense, enabled him to assume an effective leadership in the Congress on vital canal issues. His numerous contributions on these matters are the most comprehensive treatments on them by a Congressional leader in United States history. In recognition of their importance, the Congress has published a volume of his selected addresses under the title of *Isthmian Canal Policy Questions* (Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress).

For nearly two decades our speaker's scholarly addresses in and out of the Congress and courageous leadership have won him national and international acclaim as a leading Congressional authority on canal problems. He will soon speak on this subject over the Manion Forum radio network and over the CBS TV "60 Minutes" program.

Theodore Roosevelt always considered that the most important contribution of his administration was the construction of the Panama Canal, which opened the Gateway to the Pacific. In view of the tremendous services of our speaker in defending it, it is fitting that his place in history should be as the savior of the Canal.

It is now my honor to present Representative Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania who will address us on the timely and challenging subject "Panama Canal: Pawn in International Power Politics."

PANAMA CANAL: PAWN IN INTERNATIONAL POWER POLITICS

Mr. President, Members of the National Aviation Club, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Among the most gravely vital issues now before the Congress are those affecting what is the jugular vein of the Americas: (1) the threat to continued undiluted United States sovereign control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and (2) the completion of the Canal's suspended major modernization (Ho. Rept. No. 92–1629, p. 36).

Before these subjects can be properly understood and evaluated, it is essential to know certain elemental facts in canal history:

First, in 1901, in a treaty with Great Britain, the United States made the long term commitment to construct and operate an Isthmian canal under the rules governing the operation of the Suez Canal.

Second, in 1902, the Congress authorized the President to acquire by treaty the "perpetual control" of a Canal Zone, as well as the purchase of all property in it, for the "perpetual" operation of the Canal.

Third, in 1903, after the secession of Panama from Colombia, the United States purchased from Panama a grant "in perpetuity" of sovereign rights, power and authority over the indispensable protective frame of the Canal known as the Canal Zone for $10,000,000. This sum, though small on the basis of 1974 values, is greater than that paid for either Florida or Alaska. In the same treaty, our country assumed the annual obligation of the Panama Railroad for $250,000, previously paid by that company to Colombia. This annuity, justifiably adjusted in the 1936 treaty and gratuitously increased in the 1955 Treaty, is not a "rental" for the use of the Canal Zone, as so often stated in the press, but only the augmented annuity of the Panama Railroad, the entire stock of which was bought by the United States for the unrestricted use of that rail line for constructing the canal and its later maintenance and operation.

Fourth, after acquiring the Zone, the United States obtained title to all privately owned land and property in it from individual owners, making the Zone our most expensive territorial acquisition, estimated in 1973 to have cost $161,938,571, which is more than the costs of all our other acquisitions combined (Congressional Record, Vol. 119, pt. XIV, p. 18431).

Fifth, the United States between 1904 and 1914 constructed the Canal in a spot that was the pest hole of the world and a land of endemic revolution, transforming the Zone and surrounding areas into models of tropical health and sanitation that won world acclaim and has served as a force for political stability.

Sixth, the United States under a 1914 Treaty with Colombia, ratified in 1922, paid that country $25,000,000 and gave it valuable transit rights in the use of both the Canal and Railroad. In return Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus prior to November 3, 1903, recognized the title to both the Canal and Railroad as vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States.

Seventh, the total investment of the taxpayers of our country in the canal enterprise, including its defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1971, was $5,695,745,000.

Eighth, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States solely in the Congress, which includes the House of Representatives as well as the Senate.

From all of the above, the evidence is conclusive that the United States is not a squatter resting on the banks of the Panama Canal but its lawful owner. In addition, the validity of the title of the United States to it has been recognized by the Supreme Court (Wilson vs. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 1907, at 31–3) and no amount of demagoguery or sophistry can alter the essential facts.

As was foreseen by the able leaders of our government, in the early part of the 20th Century, who developed our historic Isthmian Canal policies, the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, in a realistic sense, form part

of the coast line of the United States; and today it transits some 15,000 vessels annually. Thus its continued efficient operation and protection are just as vital to interoceanic commerce and Hemispheric security as are the safe navigation and defense of the Chesapeake Bay or the Mississippi River.

Perceptive students of U.S. foreign policy in recent years have increasingly recognized that the U.S. Department of State has been infiltrated by elements hostile to continued United States sovereign control over the U.S. owned Canal Zone. Its record has been one of misrepresentation and falsification. Its purpose has been not the protection of United States interests at Panama but the waging of campaigns of deceit against the people of our country as so often illustrated by that agency's repeated efforts to dismember the Canal Zone by piecemeal erosions. For example, in the case of the Panama Railroad, the State Department planned to liquidate that important rail link and actually succeeded in giving away its freight yards and passenger stations in Panama City and Colon. The Congress stepped into the situation and after thorough study of the road's operations, saved the main line. Now, you have a railroad without its designed terminals. Can you imagine anything more stupid?

It was, therefore, no surprise to a growing number of well informed members of the Congress, when on February 7, 1974, U.S. Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger, and Panamanian Foreign Minister, Juan A. Tack, without advance authorization by the Congress, signed an 8-point "agreement on principles" to govern the negotiation of a new canal treaty. (Congressional Record, Vol. 120, Feb. 13, 1974, p. 2998.)

Stripped of its ambiguities, contradictions and fallacies, this piece of diplomatic trickery is a blueprint for an abject surrender of United States treaty-based sovereign rights, power and authority over our most strategic waterway that is certain to open a Pandora's Box of difficulties. Related to these will be the treaty rights of Great Britain and Colombia as well as the interests of all maritime nations that use the canal and have to pay tolls. Some of these countries are already delving into the situation and will undoubtedly take steps to protect their interests.

As to the appeal so often made to North American idealism and generosity in the form of "returning" the Canal Zone to Panama, what are the facts? That country prior to November 3, 1903, was a part of Colombia, from which it seceded. It did this only after years of frustrated waiting for Colombia to arrange for the construction of the canal at the Panama site. When Panamanian leaders saw their long hoped for project endangered by the authorized construction of a canal at Nicaragua, Panama revolted and declared its independence from Colombia to obtain this vital waterway.

When construction by the United States was started in 1904 the jubilation of the Panamanian people was practically unanimous. As foreseen, extensive employment of Panamanians and other economic advantages quickly brought a prosperity to Panama not equalled elsewhere in Central America.

Panama's jurisdiction over what was to become the Canal Zone territory was brief, officially ceasing on ratification of the 1903 Treaty, which was February 26, 1904. This means that Panama had jurisdiction over the Zone for only three months and 23 days—a very weak basis on which to justify giving Panama the Zone territory. If the Zone is to be given to any country it should not be given to Panama but to Colombia; but I feel certain that the Congress would be just as adamant in opposing such proposal as it is to giving it to Panama.

The President of the United States, in a mistaken gesture of friendship and on recommendation of the State Department, on September 14, 1960, after the adjournment of the Congress and in disregard of a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 382 to 12 in opposition to the display of the Panama flag in the Zone, directed that it be flown at one place in the Canal Zone as "visual evidence" of Panama's "titular sovereignty" over that territory. Instead of improving relations this action served to extend the breach in the dikes of our juridical structure on the Isthmus caused by the 1936 and 1955 Treaties, with the predicted result that Panama would interpret such display as an admission by the United States of full Panamanian sovereignty. Today, Panama flags are flying from one end of the Zone to the other equal with those of the United States, and even on such vital structures as the locks, thus tending to promote agitations for full Panamanian control. Most certainly, these flags should be removed for the flag has only one meaning and that is sovereignty; and the only flag that should fly in the Zone is that of the United States.

What is meant by "titular sovereignty" that has been so often used in the press? This expression has a long history going back to the time of Secretary of State Hay and Secretary of War Taft, who recognized that by the terms of the 1903 Treaty Panama retained what those statesmen in an unfortunate slip of language, called a "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone.

Actually no such phrase can be found in the treaty by which the United States acquired the Canal Zone. Neither a Secretary of State nor any government functionary had the authority then or at any time to imply any curtailment whatever of the total sovereignty as defined in the Treaty. Any abridgment involving the disposal of territory or other property of the United States would require the preponderant action of both Houses of the Congress, At best, "titular sovereignty" can only mean a reversionary interest on the part of Panama in the sole event the United States should abandon the Canal or fail to meet its treaty obligations to maintain, operate, sanitate and protect it. Despite my repeated requests, the State Department has failed to correct that unfortunate error, "titular sovereignty", which failure has added to the public confusion surrounding the Canal Zone sovereignty question.

As previously indicated, there are only two basic issues regarding the Panama Canal: (1) continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone; and (2) the major modernization of the existing canal. All other matters, however important, including the extensively propagandized sea level proposal, are asserted to be "irrelevant" (Ho. Rept. No. 92–1629, p. 36).

The prolonged agitations over Canal Zone sovereignty have served to delay and confuse the proper solution for major modernization, with resulting inconvenience to the users of the Canal and those who operate it.

As to whether the United States should surrender its sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, there is no doubt as to how our people feel. Following a national TV debate on this question over *The Advocate* program on March 15, 1973, more than 12,000 citizens reported their views, with 86 percent of them against any surrender to Panama. In recent weeks, my own correspondence from 48 of the United States and abroad is almost unanimous in opposition to the projected giveaway. In addition, State Legislatures have passed resolutions opposing it and more are in the process of doing so.

As stated on other occasions, I can think of no better way to cause another time-wasting confrontation with the Congress than to send to it a treaty calling for the transfer to Panama of the U.S. Canal Zone territory. In that event, the Congress, in the exercise of its Constitutional responsibility (U.S. Constitution, Art. IV, Section 3, Clause 2) will dispose of such a pact of intended subservience where it belongs—in the waste basket.

United States policy of exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone and Canal is based upon realities, including treaties with Great Britain and Colombia. For the United States to assume the obligation of operating and defending the Canal after surrender of sovereignty over its protective frame of the Canal Zone, would place our country in the position of having grave responsibility without requisite authority, which is unthinkable in the management of a project of such magnitude of importance.

The operation of the Canal by the United States on an extra-territorial basis in a land of endless intrigue and turmoil could only result in endless conflicts and recriminations. Besides, it would result in the removal of an island of stability on the Isthmus that has often served as a haven of refuge for Panamanian leaders seeking to escape assassination. One of the most recent Panamanians to seek refuge there was Senor Torrijos, the wife of Panama's Chief of Government, during an attempt to depose her husband while he was out of his country. Most certainly, the Congress will never appropriate huge funds for a canal project in an area that the United States does not control and that during the last 70 years has had 59 presidents.

To clarify the sovereignty question there have been introduced in both House and Senate multi-sponsored and fully pro-United States resolutions expressing in the strongest possible terms opposition to the surrender at Panama of any of our sovereign rights, power, authority or property, except by treaty authorized in advance by the Congress and ratified by the United States. The giveaways contemplated in the previously mentioned "agreement on principles" for the negotiation of a new canal treaty were not authorized by the Congress and are obvious attempted usurpations of power that must be put down.

The recent : ttitude of the State Department as regards the sovereignty issue can have no reasonable interpretation as an honest effort to ease tensions. Instead, its officials know that Dictator Torrijos of Panama has publicly proclaimed his esteem for the Castro regime in Cuba, expressed his admiration for the Soviets, and openly threatened violence against the Canal Zone. This is the strong man of the pro-Red defacto government in Panama to which self proclaimed liberals in the State Department seek to deliver our Panama Canal. These officials have not even troubled to stipulate any terms for payment by Panama for the billions that the taxpayers of the United States have spent on the Canal enterprise and its defense.

As for the major modernization of the existing Canal, this project was authorized in 1939 under existing treaty provisions, started in 1940, but suspended in 1942 because of more urgent war needs after the expenditure of some $76,000,000, mostly for huge lock site excavations at Miraflores and Gatun that are usable. When to this sum are added $95,000,000 spent on the widening of Gaillard Cut that was completed in 1970, the amounts already applied toward the major modernization of the Canal Zone total more than $171,000,000.

During World War II there was developed in the Panama Canal organization, as a result of war experience, what is known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan which won the approval of President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a post war project. Most significantly, this plan does not require a new treaty with Panama, which fact is a paramount consideration. Legislation for it, now pending in both Senate and House, has aroused strong support among important shipping interests, engineers, ecologists, navigators, and other experts, including Panama Canal pilots, who know more about the marine operations of the canal than any other professional group in the world. Moreover, the Terminal Lake-Third Locks solution has the great advantage

of preserving the fresh water barrier of Gatun Lake between the oceans, thus preventing the infestation of the Atlantic Ocean with the poisonous Pacific sea snake and the voracious crown of thorns starfish.

When the long overdue work on the major modernization proposal is resumed, its economic and other advantages to the Isthmus and inter-oceanic commerce will be so obvious that current agitations in Panama over sovereignty should vanish like a tropical fog in the morning sun.

Historically, the Caribbean has long been a focal area of conflict because its location is strategic. Today, Soviet power has Cuba, Soviet submarines cruise regularly in nearby waters, and the main Soviet objective is directed toward wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States, making that vital waterway a pawn in international power politics. Thus, the real issue involved in the Canal Zone sovereignty question is not United States control versus Panamanian but continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the Zone versus U.S.S.R. control; and these are the issues that should be debated in the Congress and the mass news media. The importance of these questions is shown by the recent co-sponsorship in the U.S. Senate by 35 members of a resolution opposing any surrender at Panama and their discussion in Atlanta at the current meeting of O.A.S. foreign ministers.

The elements of the news media that most loudly advocate surrender of the Canal Zone to Panama are precisely those that urged United States support to Communist Mao Tse-Tung in China with the claim that he was only a mild agrarian reformer and later urged the installation of Fidel Castro in Cuba while ridiculing evidence that Castro was a Red revolutionary.

What is needed now is prompt action on pending measures in the Congress concerning sovereignty and major modernization. Their adoption and enactment, respectively, will quickly clear up the present confused atmosphere as regards United States sovereign control over the Canal Zone and facilitate resumption of work on the major increase of transit capacity and long needed operational improvements. Completion of this project will provide at least cost the best canal for the transit of vessels practicable of achievement and greatly increase its concentrational capabilities for our naval forces. The last will be of increasing importance as the numbers of our naval vessels go down toward their pre-World War II level.

Thus to get on with our great responsibility and obligation to enlarge the Panama Canal and improve its operations, we must be uncompromisingly emphatic in declaring that our answer to any proposed abrogation or curtailment of complete United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone is a resounding no; and we will say it again, again

---

STATES IMPROVE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, proponents of the national postcard voter registration bill (H.R. 8053) argue that the postcard system is needed because the States have refused, or at least have been reluctant, to institute changes in their systems of voter registration.

I believe that the assumption that the States have not acted is a Washington-type assumption, based on ignorance of local conditions. Many changes have occurred in the various States throughout this country in the past several years, particularly since the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Registration systems and requirements have been simplified. Procedures have been modernized. Southern States, particularly, have made great improvements. North Carolina has what is generally considered to be the best data processing program for its registration system, and the Virginia registration law has been completely rewritten and is considered a model.

Since the Congress has been considering a postcard registration bill, I have had much correspondence with Secretaries of State and local registration officials. While the communication was directed toward analysis of postcard registration, I would like to share with my colleagues some of the statements contained in that correspondence from the Secretaries of State which reveals some of the interesting changes and new programs of registration.

Here are some of the examples:

Missouri did not have a state-wide registration until last year when a bill was passed which modernized and simplified their registration procedures in the following ways:

Voters may register by mail if they are unable to get to a registration office because of illness, disability, absence from the county, or by reasons of employment.

A voter's registration is not automatically stricken if the voter does not exercise his right to vote.

Transfers of registration (when a voter moves) may be made entirely by mail.

Voters who move after the close of registration are not prohibited from voting, but may cast their ballots at their old polling places.

The primary method of canvassing the rolls is in conjunction with the United States Postal Service (a sharp distinction from the old method of door-to-door canvassing, where frequently voters were stricken from the rolls because they were not at home when they were canvassed.)

Registration officials may appoint as many deputies as they need.

Registration can be conducted in county court houses, city halls, and at any other location.

Finally, the bill enacting these provisions has an unusual "purpose clause" which is worth noting: "It is the intent of this act that the election officials of each county, in connection with the registration of voters and in order to promote and encourage voter registrations, shall establish a sufficient number of registration places throughout the county and at such days and hours for the convenience of persons desiring to register, to the end that registration may be maintained at a high level."

JAMES C. KIRKPATRICK,
Secretary of State, Missouri.

The State of Colorado increased their registration roles between the primary election and the general election in 1972 by approximately 25 percent throughout the State and in some of the larger counties it exceeded 35 percent during that same period. This dramatic increase came about because:

The County Clerks' offices throughout the State are very strategically located for the registration of new voters in that, besides branch offices of the County Clerk in the larger counties and branch registration offices before elections, our law also permits the City Clerks or Municipal Clerks of all the municipalities in Colorado, of which there are over 250, to be ex-officio registrars of the County Clerks for registration of electors.

JAMES L. ETTEMILLER,
Elections Officer,
State of Colorado.

One of the chief arguments in favor of a national postcard system is that existing State registration systems serve as an obstacle to voter participation. However, in Idaho almost 90 percent of their voting population is now registered under a semipermanent card registration system:

Existing registration provisions do not require re-registration unless an elector: (1) changes residence, (2) changes name, or, (3) fails to vote at least once during an eight-year period.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Secretary of State, Idaho.

Many States have instituted law which provides for evening registration and additional registration localities such as New Jersey and Wyoming:

The State Law also provides that, "in each county the commissioner of registration shall submit to the Secretary of State on or before June 15 of each year a plan of evening registration for the general election. Such plan shall include making available in each municipality, the place or places to be opened between the hours of 6 o'clock and 9 o'clock in the evening for at least 6 working days immediately preceding the close of registration. Evening registration facilities shall also be made available in each municipality once each week during the 6 calendar weeks immediately preceding the close of registration for the general election."

The commissioner or county board of elections may provide for mobile registration within their counties. This plan has worked well over the years, since it is convenient for most individuals and it saves them time and eliminates traveling any great distance to reach the county or municipal offices.

J. EDWARD CRABIEL,
Secretary of State, New Jersey.

Wyoming makes registration for voting quite simple. Registration may take place in the office of the county clerk or at special localities set up by the county clerk. In addition, Wyoming presently allows for absentee registration by mail. Upon request a registration oath card is mailed to the elector.

THYRA THOMSON,
Secretary of State, Wyoming.

Other States, like Nebraska, who has approximately 850,000 voters registered, have just stopped short of imposing criminal sanction for failure to cast a ballot:

Here in Nebraska we have a voter registration deadline of ten days before the election—not thirty. We provide for registration with the absentee and disabled ballot. Our absentee and disabled ballots are ready for distribution thirty five days before the election. We have provided hundreds of additional places of registration.

In Nebraska during the last week of registration, the various registration officials maintain office hours each evening in addition to the regular hours. We have ruled that the students can register within their home town or the college town. We have substantially liberalized the disabled voter situation. For example, the ballots can be removed from the polling place and taken to a wheelchair patient parked outside of the polling place. We provide that any other voter can attest to the disability of a person applying for a disabled ballot. Our law provides for transpor-

tation of disabled voters to the polling place. We also have special laws to help the blind and paraplegic voters in that they may be assisted in the voting booth by a member of the immediate family.

ALLEN J. BEERMANN,
Secretary of State, Nebraska.

The significance of these changes is that they demonstrate the awareness of the States that registraton procedures have been too restrictive in the past. The States are moving ahead quite vigorously in this area, and can be expected to do more in the future.

APPRECIATION SHOWN FOR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the economy of Rhode Island suffered a stunning blow when the Department of Defense ordered huge cutbacks in the naval facilities at Quonset, Davisville, and Newport. With the loss of the Navy, the largest single employer in Rhode Island, prophets of doom speedily arose to voice dire forebodings. Once again, as it has since the days of founder Roger Williams, the resilient spirit inherent in the character of Rhode Islanders bounced up to confront adversity and turn it to advantage.

With courage and initiative, the citizens took positive action toward economic recovery, first seeking aid from the appropriate Federal agencies, such as the Small Business Administration.

In similar circumstances, Federal agencies proffering help are often abused and slandered by the populace, and rarely accorded the smallest degree of gratitude or acknowledgement. From Newport, R.I., one of the hardest hit areas in the naval cutbacks, Councilman Lawrence E. Newsome has extended thanks and appreciation for the Small Business Administration's endeavors on behalf of that city. I would like to acquaint my colleagues with the sentiments of Newport, Mr. Newsome, and all Rhode Island, as addressed to Mr. Thomas S. Kleppe, Administrator of the Small Business Administration:

NEWPORT, R.I., *March 31, 1974.*

MR. THOMAS S. KLEPPE,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLEPPE: It has been almost a year since the Department of Defense announced the cutback in Newport, Rhode Island, and I felt this was a good time to reflect on what has been accomplished during the past year to facilitate our economic recovery.

As a city official who has been deeply involved in improving the business climate, I thought you would be interested in one of the foremost impressions that has been left with the City Council. From the day of the disestablishment announcement we have received more attention and cooperation from the Small Business Administration than all the other agencies combined. The direction we have received has made our job much easier.

We would especially like to thank Dan Koehler of the Washington Office and locally, Charley Fogarty and his team including Ed Migliaccio and Sal DeSimone. These gentlemen have made countless trips to Newport to participate in workshops, meetings, and individual conferences. Their understanding and expertise have been warmly welcomed by the City Council and especially by the small business community. It is hoped that this cooperation will continue as long as there are small business people in Newport who need your help.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE E. NEWSOME.

EGLIN AFB WINS 1974 HENNESSY TROPHY AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the fact that Eglin Air Force Base in Florida's first and finest district has been named a winner of the 1974 Hennessy Trophy Award. I am proud of this base for its many outstanding contributions to the Nation's defense.

Details on the Hennessy Trophy Award are contained in the release which I submit herewith for printing in the RECORD:

EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.—AFSC—AND SHU LIN KOU AIR STATION, TAIWAN—USAFSS—HAVE BEEN NAMED THE WINNERS OF THE 1974 HENNESSY TROPHY AWARDS

The Hennessey Trophy competition honors the memory of John L. Hennessy, a member of the World War II civilian board appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to assist the military with food service problems. The Air Force Hennessy Awards are designed to recognize and commend those special Air Force bases which excel in the management, preparation, and service of food to their personnel.

Eglin won in the multiple-unit category which is for bases with more than one food service facility. Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska (Alaskan Air Command), was second.

For the second year in a row, Shu Lin Kou Air Station won in the single unit competition; the Air Force Academy placed second.

Two evaluation teams, composed of Air Force and civilian food industry representatives, visited dining halls of 15 major command nominees before making their selections. Team members examined management effectiveness, customer service, and food service techniques.

Lt. General William W. Snavely, Deputy Chief of Staff/Systems and Logistics, Hq USAF, will represent the Air Force Chief of Staff and present the trophies to the winners May 18 in Chicago at the annual convention banquet of the National Restaurant Association (which has sponsored the awards program since 1956).

W. HENSON PURCELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess while the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was not being printed I was unable to announce to the Congress the passing of one of America's most outstanding senior editors, columnist and humanitarians of all time. I am sorry to announce that on Saturday, April 13, 1974, Mr. W. Henson Purcell, senior editor of the West Frankfort, Ill. Daily American passed away in the Union Hospital in that city. Mr. Speaker, this RECORD would not hold all of the sterling qualities and accomplishments of Henson Purcell. He had received almost every National, State, and local award that the journalism profession could offer. His "A Father's Farewell to His Soldier Son" feature story in 1947 won the National Headliners top award, the Silver Medallion for consistently excellent feature writing. In addition to dozens of other awards from the wire services and other media Mr. Purcell wrote a daily column called "Mine Run", which was read and enjoyed all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, the age which seems to be passing into history has been an age of strong men. Strong in character. Strong in dedication and loyalty to God and country. Strong in the bond of family love. Henson Purcell was the epitome of all of these strong attributes and many more too numerous to mention.

Mr. Speaker, during my 20 years in Congress I learned much from the friendship and writings of Henson Purcell. He has created a void in our community that cannot be filled. His lovely wife whom he called affectionately in his column, "Lona Beth Lee" their two daughters, Mrs. Ray Curry of St. Louis, Mo. and Mrs. Andrew Patterson, El Cajon, Calif., a son, Dr. Thomas Purcell, of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill., two brothers and two sisters and a host of grandchildren and great-grandchildren can be truly proud of this dedicated Christian American. Mr. Speaker, Henson Purcell loved southern Illinois with a fierce passion.

Traveling about the beautiful countryside motivated him to achieve great things for his fellow man. He was active in church work, civic, and fraternal organizations, the Salvation Army, and many other worthwhile organizations in addition to his great contribution to the journalistic field. Henson Purcell has left a great monument in his community for his life and work. His death has saddened us very deeply but we thank God for having sent him our way.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Purcell's colleagues at the West Frankfort Daily American have written an editorial that speaks far more eloquently than any words I can utter, therefore, under previous order granted me I herewith include an editorial from the Monday, April 15, 1974 edition of the Daily American entitled "W. Henson Purcell. He's Cast a Long Shadow":

W. HENSON PURCELL—HE'S CAST A LONG SHADOW

The news story on page one of this issue, announcing the passing of Henson Purcell, does not adequately portray the full significance of his contributions to The Daily American or to the West Frankfort community over the past 57 years.

He had the finest character of any man we have ever known.

He had understanding and compassion.

He was unafraid to take an editorial position because it was unpopular.

W. Henson Purcell was a great editor because he was a great human being. He was the epitome of character in upholding the public interest for almost 60 years.

Some men love money. Others love power. W. Henson Purcell loved the truth.

A primary reason for Henson's success

over the years in his many endeavors, both journalistic and civic, had been the great human qualities of the man—his compassion, understanding and concern for others. Their problems became his problems. Others sorrows caused him grief. And nothing made him happier than to rejoice in the good fortune of his friends and associates.

These great qualities were reflected in his management of The Daily American—in his dealings with the public and with his staff.

These same qualities were reflected in the type of civic activity that drew his interest and attention—his church, the local Salvation Army, the Chamber of Commerce, The West Frankfort Community Council, the city government, the public school system and countless others. Selflessness and love of mankind prompted him to work long hours in trying circumstances in which he believed.

While the entire West Frankfort community has suffered a great loss with the passing of Henson Purcell, The Daily American family has suffered an irreplaceable loss. As stated in the news story, for many of us working at The Daily American, it will no longer seem the same. His death marks the passing of an era—of a generation of great newspaper people whose skills and devotion have made The Daily American what is is today.

If, as Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, "an institution is the lengthened shadow of one man," W. Henson Purcell's shadow looms large over The Daily American and the entire West Frankfort Community.

NEED FOR SOME CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, today, April 30, marks the last day for the Economic Stabilization Act. On May 1 not only will there be no more wage and price controls, but all of the Economic Stabilization Act's monitoring machinery will cease to exist.

As one Member of Congress, I feel very strongly that we have let the country down. While wage/price controls, especially in phases III and IV were not very effective, this country still needs an agency which can oversee the problems of inflation. I believe it is an unfortunate overreaction by Congress that brings us to a situation where we are willing to completely dismantle the wage/price monitoring machinery. It is ironic that this overreaction comes at a time when the United States is facing a soaring double-digit inflationary spiral.

I would hope that Congress might reconsider its earlier inaction and at least approve the existence of a watchdog agency, even if this agency is devoid of specific power to institute controls on wages and prices.

I would like to conclude my remarks by inserting an excellent article written by Hobart Rowen, the financial editor of the business section of the Washington Post.

REQUIEM FOR CONTROLS

(By Hobart Rowen)

Thanks to an extraordinarily efficient lobbying job by business and labor groups—especially the AFL-CIO—the prospect that any form of wage and price controls will be continued after April 30 is dead.

The Nixon administration, which never wanted controls in the first place, lost the opportunity for standby controls by equivocating on the issue.

Even the skeleton authority provided in an eleventh-hour bill introduced by Rep. William J. Stanton (R-Ohio) that would monitor decontrol commitments previously made by large companies has been killed by the House Banking Committee.

To abandon all government controls, as Sen. Jacob Javits (R.-N.Y.) has said, is irresponsible at a time when inflation rates in the United States are higher than at any time since the First World War.

When the administration proposed dropping virtually all controls on April 30, it confidently expected that a Democratic Congress, anxious to keep the monkey on Nixon's back, would say "no." By keeping controls in force, the Congress would have saddled the administration with the responsibility of decontrolling at a time of high inflation.

"We gave Nixon all the ammunition he needed," the Democrats on the Hill might have said. In fact, that reasoning accounts for the origin of the original economic stabilization act in 1970, which the Democrats passed over Nixon's objection—and which, when he used it on Aug. 15, 1971, stunned Democrats as well as Republicans who knew Mr. Nixon's record of opposition to controls.

But now, the Democratic leadership on the Hill has caved in completely to the business and labor pressures. With some validity, labor argues that in the past year, price control has been allowed to become ineffective but wages have been kept under tighter control.

Labor can even cite one of its current arch enemies, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns, to validate its claims that workers' real purchasing power has been cut by as much as 4 per cent during the past 12 months.

"There's nobody left for controls except a few economists," says a procontrols senator quite sadly, "and nobody is quiet sure these days that you should believe what the economists say."

Nevertheless, the prospect that the plug would be pulled all at once on April 30 disturbs Cost of Living Council Director John T. Dunlop, who has been conducting a one-man campaign for support of a compromise Democratic measure sponsored by Senators Adlai E. Stevenson (D-Ill.) and J. Bennett Johnston Jr. (D-La.) which would have kept controls for another six months, with standby authority for six months beyond that.

Originally, the administration asked for extension of mandatory controls only on health and petroleum, and intended to keep them on the construction area as well.

But the Senate Banking Committee overwhelmingly killed the Stevenson-Johnston bill, which sent Dunlop scampering valiantly for something like the Johnston bill.

There is no question that public enthusiasm for controls has dwindled.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

With prices skyrocketing, consumers obviously believe they have become useless. Ever since the unhappy—even idiotic—abandonment of Phase II in January 1973 the effectiveness of price controls has been all downhill.

So there was little doubt that April 30 was to have marked the end of one era, that of mandatory controls. But it should have marked the beginning of another—the availability to the government of formal stand-by controls. This is the route that an expert like Arnold Weber, the first COLC director, advocates.

The reasoning is that some governmental authority has to be available and sensitive to the price mechanism in this country so as to neutralize the powerful special interests that exist. Stand-by controls relating to wages are necessary as well: It is considered likely, for example, that with no government "club in the closet," construction wage increases this year will again zoom to the 10–14 per cent bracket.

Much of the potential for controlling inflation today relates to encouragement of improved supply and, again, that calls for a governmental presence to work with industry and labor.

None of this is compatible with the passionate antipathy to controls exhibted by the "free market" men of the Nixon administration: Shultz, Stein and Ash. To recall Bob Nathan's witticism, it's been like having the famous madam, Polly Adler, running a convent.

But Democrats on the Hill no longer can point to the administration as bearing the sole responsibility for a runaway inflation. They have failed the country by succumbing to business and labor interests.

As Weber says, "the (controls) orphan may not have been rolled under a truck, but it's been allowed to waste away in the snow."

HEAVY LIFT HELICOPTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, quietly and with little internal discussion or congressional oversight, the Army has converted an $80.6 million advanced technology component program—ATC—for a proposed heavy lift helicopter—HLH—into a huge $252 million program that includes the building of two complete prototypes of the proposed HLH.

Boeing Aircraft, the principal contractor for the HLH program has enjoyed an increase in its contract from an initial award of $67.3 million to a current value of $137 million—a lucrative 100 percent increase in their contract. The total cost increase from $80 million to $252 million represents a 213 percent cost growth on the program.

While violating both congressional mandates and Department of Defense regulations, the Army through bureaucratic maneuvering and quiet prodding has converted a simple, relatively low-cost program into a huge helicopter program. The history of the Army's efforts to build this flying white elephant is a perfect example of how minor research and development projects acquire a bureaucratic life of their own and are converted without adequate internal or congressional review into major programs.

A careful review of the HLH program indicates that the project confronts so many problems that I believe that the proposed $57.7 million in this year's fiscal year budget should be deferred pending a detailed and comprehensive review by the senior officials of the Pentagon, the completion of a thorough investigation by a special General Accounting Office team specifically assigned to study this program for 6 months, and a complete and thorough review by appropriate congressional committees.

Mr. Speaker, this helicopter known as the heavy lift helicopter—HLH—is so gigantic that as presently designed it will not even fit into any of the Army's hangars. This flying monstrosity will be 162 feet 3 inches in length and 38 feet 6 inches high. Its rotary blades will be 92 feet in diameter and the entire aircraft will have a design weight of 118,000 pounds. It is designed normally to carry a payload of 22.5 tons.

Even before the Army began its quiet

movement to convert a minor program into a major and costly effort, the Pentagon had consciously and arrogantly violated a specific congressional directive by permitting the building of two heavy lift helicopters—one by the Army and the other by the Navy—instead of one. In 1971 the Defense Appropriation Act conference report said that "the Department of Defense is directed to revise the heavy lift helicopter program" so that one aircraft could be built for the Army and the Navy/Marine Corps. In January 1972 the Pentagon decided to build two different heavy lift helicopters—HLH for the Army and the CH53E for the Navy/Marine Corps. The crucial difference between the capabilities of the two aircraft is the HLH's ability to lift 22.5 tons as opposed to the CH53E's capacity for lifting 16 tons.

The Army's bureaucracy has converted in five steps the award of the $67.3 million advanced technology component—ATC—contract to Boeing Vertol in June 1971 into a $252 million program which may snowball into a multibillion dollar procurement disaster involving huge cost increases.

Step one was selecting the contractor. Originally the request for proposal—RFP—indicated that several contractors should compete in the ATC program for the development of advanced technology components for the HLH helicopter. Then something strange happened. One complete proposal offered by the Sikorsky Helicopter Co., was for some unknown reason, labeled nonresponsive. The Boeing Co. was selected for the ATC program. Even though Sikorsky was willing to build and flight test for 50 hours the complete helicopter for $78.6 million Boeing was selected. Two unanswered questions are: why was the Sikorsky proposal never evaluated and why was Boeing selected without any other competitors? Ignoring the provision of the original RFP obviously stifled industrial competition and made Boeing the primary beneficiary of this unfolding boondoggle.

Step two was adding to the ATC program a complete engine which could be flight tested.

Originally the ATC or the advanced technology component program was planned to include the so-called bench testing of the rotor system, cargo system, and flight control system of a new heavy lift helicopter using a simple diesel engine—not one designed to actually fly the HLH. In addition, a dynamic system test rig—DSTR—was to be erected in order to test various parts of these crucial components at the same time.

But, in April 1972 the Department of the Army awarded a specific $15.5 million addition to Boeing's existing contract to provide specific flight engines which could be used to actually fly a HLH helicopter. Under the initial ATC plan, a simple diesel engine would be provided since only the rotor system, the cargo system and flight control system are actually being tested. Now, the Army suddenly made a change which resulted in a quantum jump in the level of research and development effort. The HLH was off and running and it had acquired a bureaucratic stamina of its own.

When the ATC program was expanded to include a full-scale flight engine Boeing Vertoil was authorized to award a $9.5 million subcontract to the Allison Corp. to build new engines for ATC tests. According to Boeing's original ATC contract, the company can earn a 3-percent fixed fee and a potential 12-percent award fee. According to the recent investigation of the General Accounting Office, Boeing could earn award fees potentially valued at $1.6 million. The GAO determined that these fees were "unrealistic and excessive." Since Boeing's management effort on the $15.5 million contract was only $1 million and its overhead about $3 million, this special incentive of $1.6 million is totally unnecessary.

The contracting officer for the HLH program realized this fee was incredibly excessive and decided to redistribute $800,000 to other ATC technical projects. GAO attempted to determine whether the redistribution of the $800,000 and potential award fees were justified or not. They concluded that they could not find any additional work or risk to justify the additional award fees.

In other words, Boeing will probably earn a totally unjustified and completely unnecessary fee for its work on this contract. In addition, by selecting one contractor now for the prototype engines Boeing has probably limited future competition on production engines. In fact, project office officials admitted to GAO that "only a small possibility exists for any competition developing HLH production engines."

Step three took place on January 29, 1973, when the Army again expanded Boeing Vertol's contract on the HLH program. They added $56.5 million in order to build a so-called austere prototype. The prototype would be flight tested and now all components of a proposed HLH helicopter would actually be built.

Congress reacted coolly to the proposal for the first prototype. In fact, in fiscal year 1973 the Congress reduced the amount for the HLH program from $53 million to $38 million—the difference of $15 million representing the amount requested to initiate the development program.

The Army chose once again to ignore specific congressional directives from the House Appropriations Committee and proceeded to award the development contract for the program. The Army disregarded a clear congressional indication by the House Appropriations Committee of its disapproval of the prototype program.

Like all other major weapons systems the Army began preparing a so-called selected acquisition report—SAR—on the HLH program. According to the Pentagon instruction—7000.3—the SAR report which is provided to Congress on a quarterly basis requires that total program acquisition costs include the development, procurement and construction costs of any of the major defense systems. The Army, in its SAR report has never provided an estimate of the total program cost or the cost of procurement of this particular helicopter. The Army's refusal to disclose the total procurement in the SAR report is a blatant and conscious defiance of Pentagon regulations.

In fact, the Army has been very slippery in providing adequate cost estimates of the HLH even when pressed by congressional committees. In 1973 testimony the Pentagon indicated that the approximate cost per aircraft for the HLH would be $6.7 million if 250 helicopters were purchased and $8 million if only 100 helicopters were purchased.

This year in response to congressional inquiries the Army has claimed that the cost of the helicopters—the airframe and engines—will only be approximately $5.8 million.

Mr. Speaker, the Army's various estimates of the cost of the HLH are almost comical and, frankly, ludicrous. First of all, no one seriously believes that more than 100 of these aircraft will be purchased. Hence, the minimum price is $8 million. Second, these cost figures are not based on any detailed analysis study which normally accompanies such a cost estimate. Third, the estimates have been based on 1973 or earlier dollars which do not take into account any inflation. After discussions with various experts on helicopter procurement I am convinced that this cost estimate is unrealistic and bears little if any relationship to the final cost of the helicopter.

Step four occurred in January 1974 when the Army approved a plan to build a second prototype which would cost approximately $38.5 million and bring the total cost of the two prototypes scheduled to $88 million.

Step five is a plan developed by the Army to expand Boeing contracts by a $23.6 million program for so-called reliability and maintainability tests for the HLH.

As its recent General Accounting Office report noted without any reliability and maintainability projects "Boeing Vertol anticipates having to reduce its HLH engineering manpower by 50 percent at the scheduled completion of the prototype phase."—June 1975. Since the decision to begin formal engineering development will not be made until April 1976, Boeing needs a little cash to tide itself over for this 10-month period. In other words, we are paying funds to "keep the line open" even before the line has really entered production. These additional reliability and maintainability contracts are an undisguised effort to pump more cash into Boeing's corporate coffers before a decision to proceed with further development in April 1976.

Thus, since June 1971 when the first ATC contract was awarded to Boeing Vertol, the program has been increased first with an advanced engine, second with a first prototype, third with a second prototype, and now, fourth, with expensive reliability and maintainability tests.

Throughout its whole history of expanding this HLH program, the Department of the Army has never provided any persuasive evidence to indicate that they need this giant helicopter. In fact, I believe that the Department of the Navy is at the moment producing a version of

its CH53E helicopter which at a relatively low cost can perform almost exactly the same mission as the HLH. In any case, it is absolute foolishness and bordering on the irrational to build two heavy lift helicopters—one Army and one Navy aircraft.

The HLH has also encountered serious technical problems. On December 2, 1973, there was a catastrophic failure of the aft transmission during the initial testing. This is the first warning sign that the program may encounter serious technical difficulties which can result in costly redesigns.

There is also a problem connected with the total weight of the HLH. In September 1973, Boeing estimated that there was a 50-percent probability that the production HLH will weigh 121,200 pounds—more than 3,000 pounds over the original plans. Based on this estimate, two of the performance factors will not be met—the power margin of the transmission and the total load factor.

Because of its huge size the HLH helicopter will create maximum ground downwash with velocities which will be hurricane force. In fact, huge containers 8 feet by 8 feet by 20 feet could easily be blown over by the full impact of the HLH's ground washwinds.

Finally, there may be technical probblems connected with the building of tandem rotor helicopters. In the past, both the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom have given up plans to build tandem rotor helicopters currently in use in civil air services in the United States. The CH–47 Chinook is the principal tandem rotor helicopter within the current U.S. inventory and this aircraft has recently encountered some problems resulting in partial or total grounding of the helicopter.

Throughout this entire controversy the Army has made a strenuous effort to involve the Navy in its program. Mr. Speaker, I am publicly releasing today a memorandum from Mr. Norman R. Augustine, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development to Mr. David Potter, the Navy's R. & D. Chief. In his memorandum, Mr. Augustine indicates that the Army is attempting to involve the Navy in the second prototype for the HLH by making the aircraft compatible with Navy requirements. The Army is trying to persuade the Navy to become involved with this program even though the Navy is already procuring a perfectly adequate helicopter compatible with Navy requirements. Apparently, within the last 5 days the Navy has finally rejected the Army's efforts and will not participate in this program.

Compounding existing technical problems are potential schedules slippages. The GAO points out that even for the current ATC program its schedule is "highly success-oriented and leaving latitude for the reexamination if unusual problems" occur.

At the moment with such a tight schedule there may be a temptation to leave some testing incomplete in order to meet the schedule. There is also the possibility that the schedule has seriously slipped and costs increase as a result.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the HLH program is an excellent case history in how the Pentagon botches major acquisition programs. Both DOD regulations and congressional mandates have been consistently ignored. The program has been expanded without adequate DOD congressional review. There is little if any military justification for the program and the Navy is duplicating the Army's efforts. There are questionnable practices and excessive awards being given for the contractor. In short, we are heading for a major procurement disaster.

It is my hope that the Congress will eliminate funds this year for the HLH to permit a complete and total reexamination of the program.

HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. METCALFE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would establish within the Department of Housing and Urban Development a direct low-interest loan program to assist low- and middle-income homeowners in the maintenance and improvement of their homes. This legislation would also provide for an annual General Accounting Office review and audit of the housing programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Legislation of this nature is essential if we are to seriously address ourselves to the problems of deteriorating housing in both our urban and our rural areas and to the inefficient management of our housing programs. This inefficiency has been brought to our attention recently by the Federal Housing Administration scandals.

One step which we can take to arrest the deterioration of our cities is to provide incentives for individuals to remain within their respective communities. Individual homeowners are an important element of stability in our communities. They have a pride in their home and in their neighborhood. Further, homeowners have a community interest, and community involvement which is necessary for the creation and maintenance of safe, clean, and viable communities. This element of stability is especially important for inner-city communities.

I have walked the streets of my congressional district countless times and each time I do so it seems as though the number of abandoned buildings has increased. Abandoned houses, partially deserted blocks, each contributes to a decay that must be stopped and to a condition that must be reversed.

Members of the First Congressional District of Illinois Housing Task Force have been of great assistance in drafting this legislation. These individuals are concerned about the state of the inner city and want, as I do, to make the district a viable entity.

Increasing numbers of inner-city homeowners are either moving to outlying areas or are moving into rental units. This occurs because one of the major problems facing low- and middle-income homeowners is the inability to properly maintain their homes. Often the reason for improper home maintenance, which leads to neighborhood deterioration, is a lack of financial resources. After an individual has spent a disproportionate amount of his income on a mortgage with high interest rates, the homeowner has little, if any, money left for necessary repairs and upkeep. This problem is further compounded by the reluctance of many financial institutions to grant home improvement loans to low- and middle-income homeowners, especially if they are members of a minority group. The practice of "red-lining"—that is, the policy of banks and financial institutions to refuse loan applications from homeowners who live in high risk or "red-lined" neighborhoods—is familiar to many low- and middle-income homeowners. These homeowners have either been refused loans or forced to accept unusually high interest rates on loans.

It is the purpose of title I of this bill to remedy this situation, and to arrest neighborhood deterioration, by making low-interest home improvement loans available to these homeowners under a new Federal program. Eligibility for these loans would be restricted to those individuals and families who own one, two, or three-family residential structures and whose net income, as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and taking into account the Federal income tax return most recently filed by the applicant and any other current and projected information and data as may be appropriate, does not exceed $15,000. The maximum amount of any loan would be determined according to the following sliding scale:

Income	*Maximum amount of loan*
Under $6,000	$10,000
$6,001 to $9,000	7,500
$9,001 to $15,000	5,000

Each application for a loan would be accompanied by detailed plans for the repairs involved and include an estimate of the costs involved. No application would be approved unless the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or his delegate found that the proposed repairs were reasonably necessary, that the costs would not be excessive, and that the work would not involve elaborate or extravagant design or materials. Upon approval of the loan application, the actual amount of the loan granted would be only that amount necessary to effect the proposed repairs, up to and including the maximum amount allowed for the respective income group.

These loans could be used for substantial repairs to a residential structure which are reasonably necessary for its maintenance and upkeep, or to prevent damage or deterioration, or which are required in order to comply with applicable code requirements, such as structural, plumbing, and electrical repairs. These loans could not be used for improvements which are essentially decorative in nature, such as yard improvements or the replacement of otherwise

sound fixtures for decorative purposes. Nor could these loans be used for additional facilities not necessary for the maintenance and upkeep of the structure, such as a new room.

By providing these loans to low- and middle-income homeowners, we would increase their ability to maintain their homes, thereby increasing their ability to maintain their neighborhoods.

Recent reports concerning the mishandling of Federal Housing Administration funds raise serious questions as to the proper administration of federally administered housing programs. Inefficiency and waste have plagued not only the Federal Housing Administration programs but also other housing programs, both at the Federal level and at State and local levels. In an article which appeared in the May 1974 issue of the Progressive, Mr. William Chapman, national affairs correspondent for the Washington Post, reported that:

> At least sixteen Federal grand juries are now delving into allegations of housing corruption. Federal task forces which include agents from the FBI, Internal Revenue Service, and Department of Housing and Urban Development are combing the files in twenty-one "target cities." Already, the Justice Department reports, there have been 180 indictments involving 317 persons for fraud, bribery, and other crimes associated with HUD's inner-city programs for the poor.
>
> In both Philadelphia and Detroit the criminality did not consist merely of isolated cases of corruption by a few fraudulent middlemen; it was systematic thievery involving rich realtors, FHA bosses, lenders, minor appraisers, and inspectors. "It's unbelievable what went on in this city," Deputy U.S. Attorney John Housner said in Detroit. "Paying bribes was just like delivering the mail. It was a daily phenomenon."

It is the purpose of title II of this bill to make the Department of Housing and Urban Development more responsive to the needs of the community and the intentions of Congress by promoting the effectiveness of the housing programs and the efficiency and fairness of the administration of these programs through the means of the annual General Accounting Office review of these programs. Such a review would include:

First, an evaluation of the housing programs involved in order to determine whether State, regional, and local governments and agencies have adequately followed applicable comprehensive housing and community development plans, whether there has been excessive waste in the administration of such programs, and whether the funds involved have been used in conformity with applicable civil rights legislation;

Second, an evaluation of the effectiveness and fairness of the Federal administration of such programs;

Third, a determination of whether the criteria used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in approving comprehensive housing and community development plans are adequate and effectively enforced; and

Fourth, such comments and recommendations for the administrative or legislative improvement at all levels of the housing programs involved as the Comptroller General deems advisable.

This review would not only make the Department of Housing and Urban Development more accountable to Congress, but also would provide an additional incentive to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to effectively administer its housing programs. The General Accounting Office would be directed to complete its review and audit within 6 months after the end of each fiscal year. A copy of the final report and any preliminary reports would be sent to the appropriate committees of the Congress and to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Speaker, this annual review would insure that the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be responsive to the needs of the community which the Department should serve.

This bill is especially important if we are to make our urban areas livable. It is essential that individuals living in our cities, or individuals of low or moderate income residing in rural areas, be provided with the means and incentive to remain in their communities.

This bill will provide these Americans with the financial incentive to improve their own homes and give needed stability to our urban areas.

LAW DAY, USA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that once again I am reserving a special order for May 1, Law Day USA. Law Day has been set aside by joint congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation as a special day for the American people to rededicate themselves to the ideals of equality and justice under law.

This country was founded upon the principle that we are a nation of laws, not of men. It is not an exaggeration to say that a reaffirmation of the rule of law is more important today than ever before in our history. I respectfully invite all my colleagues to join me in this special order to recommit ourselves to that principle.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO END TAX LOOPHOLES FOR UNNECESSARY BUSINESS USE DEDUCTION OF PERSONAL RESIDENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to end one of the most serious and rapidly growing tax loophole abuses in the Internal Revenue Code. The loophole involved, which is generally available only to those in the higher income brackets, involves the improper use of business deductions for the expenses of depreciation on a taxpayer's personal residence. The loophole was one which the President attempted to use in his San Clemente and Key Biscayne homes. It is used by many other professionals and higher income persons with "Aspen ski lodges" and "Florida beach cottages." It is beginning to cost the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars. Unless legislation is enacted soon, the revenue loss from the increasing and improper use of business deductions on personal residences could cost the Treasury billions.

Basically, the legislation which I have introduced reaffirms the intent of 26 U.S.C. 262 which states—quite simply—that:

> Except as otherwise expressly provided in this chapter, no deduction shall be allowed for personal, living, or family expenses.

My bill—prepared by the expert draftsmen of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—would spell out and clarify the exceptions which would be permitted:

> The ban shall not apply "with respect to that portion of a dwelling (1) which constitutes an office, shop, or other place of doing business utilized by patients, clients, or customers in meeting or dealing with the taxpayer in the normal course of his conduct of his trade or business; or (2) which the taxpayer operates as a hotel, rooming house, or similar establishment.

In other words, there generally will be no change in the tax treatment of a "Mom and Pop" grocery store where the owners live upstairs or in the back room. There should be no change in the tax treatment of the physician who uses the first floor of his home as his office and clinic.

What will be prohibited is the attempt by, say, a stockbroker to deduct a portion of his living room where he reads the morning Wall Street Journal. Not only will this amendment prevent this type of deduction in a person's principal residence, but it will also prevent that same stockbroker from deducting a portion of his Martha's Vineyard summer home because he uses a room of the summer home to keep abreast of his reading.

The legislation includes one other important section. The bill provides that if rental income is received by the taxpayer during the taxable year from his rental of a dwelling which is used as a personal residence, the ban on the deduction of expenses for the maintenance, care and use of such dwelling shall apply "to the extent such expenses exceed the amount of rents received minus the amount of taxes and interest on indebtedness which are deductible for the taxable year and attributable to such dwelling." Again, this provision is designed to deter the spreading use of tax provisions to finance second homes and vacation homes. This provision attempts to prevent the turning of homes and shelters into tax shelters.

Quoting from the staff report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, "Examination of President Nixon's Tax Returns for 1969 through 1972," the following is a statement of the tax law governing the use of homes and involving business expenses:

> Generally, there are three relevant classifications of these expenses [for business use deductions for personal residences] for tax purposes: (1) expenses incurred in connection with carrying on a trade or business; (2) expenses incurred for the production of income or for the management, conservation,

or maintenance of property held for the production of income; or (3) expenses incurred as nondeductible personal, living, and family expenses.[1]

Section 162 of the Code allows a deduction for "all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business."

With respect to the trade and business deductions of an employee, section 62(2) of the Code provides that certain of these expenses are deductible in computing adjusted gross income. Generally, these expenses are for (1) expenses paid or incurred in connection with the performance of services as an employee under a reimbursement or expense account allowance with his employer; (2) expenses for travel, meals, and lodging, while away from home,[2] which are paid or incurred in connection with the performance of services as an employee; (3) transportation expenses paid or incurred in connection with the performance of services as an employee; and (4) the trade or business expenses of an outside salesman. All other "trade or business expenses" of an employee are deductible as an itemized deduction in computing taxable income rather than as a deduction in computing adjusted gross income for purposes of section 62 of the Code.

Section 212 of the Code allows, for individuals only, a deduction for "all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year (1) for the production or collection of income; (2) for the management, conservation, or maintenance of property held for the production of income; or (3) in connection with the determination, collection, or refund of any tax."

Section 262 of the Code provides that, except as otherwise expressly provided, no deduction shall be allowed for personal, living, or family expenses. Personal and family expenses for which a deduction is expressly allowed under the Code include, for example, certain medical and dental expenses, certain household and dependent care services which are necessary to enable the taxpayer to be gainfully employed, and certain moving expenses incurred in connection with obtaining a new principal place of work.

Section 274 of the Code provides special limitations with respect to the deductibility of entertainment, amusement, or recreation expenses which would otherwise qualify as a trade or business expense.

Section 167 of the Code allows a deduction for the depreciation of property used in a trade or business (as in Sec. 162) or held for the production of income (as in Sec. 212).

Thus, any expense or depreciation amounts, which are deducted by the President, must represent ordinary and necessary expenses either for the carrying on of a trade or business or for the production of income.

As the Joint Committee pointed out, the Internal Revenue Service has been quite firm, quite concerned about limiting the nature of deductions available for the unnecessary use of one's home as a business expense. Again, quoting from the Joint Committee's monumental staff study:

Standards under which employee business expenses are determined to be "ordinary and necessary" were originally rather strictly defined in Internal Revenue Service rulings. However, more recently court decisions have been less restrictive than the Internal Revenue Service position. Given the status of the present law, it is not always clear exactly which standard is appropriate for the deduction of employee business expenses.

With respect to home office expenses, the position of the Internal Revenue Service regarding employee business expense deductions is that such expenses must be required by the taxpayer's employer as a condition of employment. Revenue Ruling 62–180, 1962–2 C.B. 52, sets forth these standards as they apply to determining the deductibility of home office expenses. That revenue ruling states:

"An employee who, as a condition of his employment, is required to provide his own space and facilities for performance of his duties and regularly uses a portion of his personal residence for that purpose may deduct a pro-rata portion of the expenses of maintenance and depreciation on his residence. However, the voluntary, occasional, or incidental use by an employee of a part of his residence in connection with his employment does not entitle him to a business expense deduction for any portion of the depreciation and expenses of maintaining his residence."

The test that employee expenses cannot be deducted unless they are required as a condition of employment was affirmed for certain expenses other than home office expenses in Revenue Ruling 70–474, 1970–2 C.B. 35, which dealt with an employee's cost of maintaining and acquiring uniforms. In that ruling the IRS stated that:

"Generally, the cost of acquisition and maintenance of uniforms is deductible [by an employee] as an ordinary and necessary business expense under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 if the uniforms are (1) specifically required as a condition of employment and (2) [do not take the place of regular clothing]."

However, at times the Internal Revenue Service has wavered somewhat from the "required as a condition of employment" test in arguments before courts and in occasional revenue rulings. For example, in Revenue Ruling 64–272, 1964–2 C.B. 55, the IRS ruled that a college professor could deduct the cost of maintaining an office at home. The professor had research and publication duties in addition to the usual lecture and teaching duties. Because the college did not furnish adequate space and facilities for carrying on such research, the IRS ruled that the professor could deduct depreciation on a portion of the maintenance expense for his personal residence. Although the ruling found that it was necessary that the professor furnish his own facilities, the standard implied by this ruling appears to come closer to a test of whether the expense is necessary to enable the employee to perform his job well in the most convenient manner rather than whether the expenditure is required as a condition of employment.

Moreover, in a recent Tax Court case, *Steven A. Bodzin*, 60 T.C. 820 (1973), the IRS argued that an employee should not be allowed deductions for a home office because the expense "was not required in order for the [taxpayer] to properly perform his employment duties." According to the IRS, the taxpayer must prove "that the nature of his duties required working after normal working hours and that his employer failed to provide him with an office that was adequate and reasonably accessible for the performance of such work."

However, some courts which have heard this issue have decided that a less restrictive standard than that urged by the Internal Revenue Service is appropriate. In the *Bodzin* case mentioned above, a majority of the Tax Court held that (60 T.C., at 825)

"The applicable test for judging the deductibility of home office expenses is whether, like any other business expense, the maintenance of an office in the home is appropriate and helpful under all the circumstances."

The court stated that a finding that the home office was simply for the taxpayer's personal convenience would bar a deduction if the court concluded that personal convenience was the primary reason for maintaining the office. Such a finding would displace any conclusion to "appropriateness" and "helpfulness."

The IRS is presently appealing the *Bodzin* case. Thus, whether the IRS position or the position taken by the Tax Court and the Second Circuit will become generally applicable to all taxpayers is yet to be decided.

Finally, to provide some idea of the type of problem being created by recent rulings, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD, some examples from a book entitled, "More Tax Tips and Tax Dodges as Reported in the Wall Street Journal." As you can see, the courts are holding that one may get a tax break for watching television at home and, in essence, taking work home. The third example explains the legal problems surrounding the personal use-rental use of a vacation home.

An office at home may be deducted more easily under a circuit court decision.

When an employe keeps an office at home, the IRS has restricted any deduction for its cost to someone whose employer required him to do so. However, the Second Circuit ruled in favor of a television time salesman for ABC who deducted part of his rent, cleaning expenses and electric bill. He used a small study every evening to plan his rounds and watch ads on ABC and competing networks.

The IRS denied the deduction because ABC didn't require the study. If the salesman wanted to work late, the IRS said, the ABC office was open and little more than 20 blocks away. But the circuit court said no law restricts a business expense to an outlay required by one's employer. It was enough for the expense to be "appropriate and helpful" in one's work. The salesman had to see as much TV as he could, the court said, and what better place than "in the isolation of his study den"?

The salesman originally deducted one-fourth the expenses of a four-room apartment. But a lower court cut the deduction to 20% because the study was so small. (Newi v. Commissioner, U.S. Ct. of Appeals, 2nd Cir., 1970.)

And office at home is ruled deductible for an insurance man over IRS objections.

The IRS still sticks pretty close to its traditional view that an employed person can't deduct an office in his home unless his employer requires him to have one. But, fortunately for people who work at home and know enough to challenge the IRS, the Tax Court isn't so rigid. It says only that a home-office must be "appropriate and helpful under the circumstances."

The sales superviser for an insurance company worked most weekday evenings in one room of his home. He read reports and sometimes interviewed prospective salesmen. The IRS contended the room duplicated the man's regular office at his company's district headquarters and he could just as well have worked there.

But the Tax Court allowed him to deduct 80% of the cost of his home office. (Gillis v. Commissioner, T. C. Memo. 1973–96).

A court rebuffs an effort to mix business with pleasure.

It's estimated that Americans are building second homes at better than 150,000 a year. But the Tax Court rejected one effort to ease the expense of a home-away-from-home. A couple owned a $75,000 "cottage" at Sea Island, Ga., which they used four months a year and offered for rent the other eight. Rents never matched cash expenses plus depreciation, however, and they tried to deduct the difference from taxable income. (They only included expenses for the eight months.)

The Tax Court refused the deduction. It said the couple failed to show any intent to make a profit, rather than simply defray expenses. It noted that over 12 years, actual rentals averaged one month a year. But the court ducked the tougher question of whether a property could be used for pleasure part of a year and genuinely run for

Footnotes at end of article.

profit during the remainder. (Carkhuff v. Commissioner, T. C. Memo. 1969-66).

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the Ways and Means Committee and the House of Representatives considers tax reform legislation this year, they will be able to adopt this important amendment.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS ADDRESSES THE INDIANA UNITED METHODIST CHURCH CONFERENCE ON PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1974, I had the privilege of delivering the keynote address at a statewide convocation of the Indiana area of the United Methodist Church.

The conference, in which, via closed circuit television 3,000 clergy and lay leaders throughout Indiana participated, was in response to the United Methodist Church "Bishops' Call for Peace and Self-Development of Peoples."

The moderator of the program was the Rev. Ralph T. Alton, bishop of the Indiana area of the United Methodist Church.

The discussions originated from the campus of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis and were carried live via the Indiana Higher Education Telecommunication system there and to 12 other State university centers in Bloomington, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Hammond, Kokomo, Lafayette, Muncie, New Albany, South Bend, Terre Haute, Vincennes, and Westville.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of my address on this occasion:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS AT UNITED METHODIST CHURCH BISHOPS' CALL FOR PEACE AND SELF-DEVELOPMENT OF PEOPLES, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., APRIL 27, 1974

I am honored to have been invited to join my fellow United Methodists throughout Indiana for this discussion today of "Peace and Self-Development of Peoples".

And I salute Bishop Ralph Alton, head of the Indiana Area of our church, and all those insight, imagination and commitment have made possible this unusual statewide conference on a subject that is crucial to the future of mankind and that should be of compelling concern to Christians everywhere.

For when confronted by the deepening deprivation and despair of the peoples of the poor nations of the world, we cannot, as Christians, walk by on the other side.

Indeed, our meeting today takes place in an extraordinary context.

Leaders of this country and of other countries of the world have in only recent months and weeks and days given voice to their rising apprehension about the situation of hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings who are, even as we speak, suffering malnutrition and, many, even starvation.

Earlier this month, our Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger; the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim; and the President of Algeria, Houari Boumediene all addressed the United Nations General Assembly on the future of the developing world.

Only this week President Nixon sent Congress his foreign aid proposals.

The World Bank has just published a major report on the subject.

The Overseas Development Council, an independent, nonprofit organization seeking to increase American understanding of the developing world, and headed by our distinguished fellow citizen of Indiana, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President of the University of Notre Dame, has just published a most valuable volume by James W. Howe entitled The U.S. and the Developing World: Agenda for Action, 1974 (Praeger Publishers, Inc., New York, New York).

And you will have all read of the declaration presented only this week to Secretary General Waldheim by the British author, C. P. Snow, on behalf of over 1000 world leaders warning of "severe malnutrition of hundreds of millions and death for many millions" unless the governments of the world act soon.

It is therefore surely most appropriate that we as Christians should address ourselves to the whole range of problems that affect so huge a percentage of the world's population.

Only yesterday I left Washington, D.C., where the air is heavy with talk of the possible impeachment of Richard Nixon.

IMPEACHMENT OF RICH NATIONS BY POOR NATIONS

But, as James Reston wrote this week in the New York Times: In New York at the United Nations, "The poor nations are drawing up the articles of impeachment every day against the rich nations."

Article I, said Reston, will charge that one of every three children born in most nations dies before the age of five.

Article II: Those who survive can expect a life of "deprivation, desperation, and degradation." But it will be mercifully short—for their life expectancy is only 30 years.

Article III: One of the worst tragedies in mankind's history unreels even now, in our time, in the draught-stricken countries of Africa—Mauritania, Mali, Niger, Chad, Upper Volta, and Ethiopia.

Article IV, said Reston, what used to be called the Christian West, and is now called the Industrial West, is systematically cheating poor nations by buying their products cheaply and selling their own at inflated prices.

Article V: Rich nations pay their workers between ten and twenty times what the laborers in poor countries receive.

The bill of impeachment is a harsh one, but who will say that it is not accurate?

THE GRIM SITUATION

And here are some of the reasons that the frustrations of the Third World have reached the level described by Mr. Reston.

Consider that, in 1971, the most developed nation in the world, the United States, had an average annual income of $5,000 per person, while the 2.3 billion people living in the under-developed nations had a yearly per capita income of only $212.

Consider that 40% of the total population of all the developing nations of the world exist below minimal levels of nutrition, literacy, and health.

Consider the words of the President of the International Bank, Robert S. McNamara, that 800 million people living in 100 underdeveloped nations "are barely on the margin of life."

And consider how much more serious is that situation today as a result of the economic events of the past twelve months.

Says James W. Home, author of the Overseas Development Council study, Agenda for Action: 1974:

"By midsummer of 1973, the world economy was in tumult. Global food scarcity, caused by a combination of rising affluence in the industrial countries, population increase in the poor countries, and drought in Asia and Africa, had become a dominant issue. Grain and soybean prices doubled and tripled—to the grave detriment of the poorest people in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America and to the benefit of American farmers and the U.S. balance of payments. The year ended with the energy shock, as the combination of the oil embargo, production cutbacks, and price increases threatened the world economy more than any other event of the past quarter century."

The world today faces the lowest reserves of grain in history—enough on hand right now, we are told, for but 27 days.

And the tripled price of oil used to extract nitrate fertilizer from the air, has made, for many, fertilizer almost impossible to obtain at any price.

As a consequence of these and other developments, the world is now moving into an era of chronic shortages of basic foodstuffs such as grains.

James P. Grant, President of the Overseas Development Council, predicts:

"The doubling to quadrupling of food and energy prices dooms millions to premature deaths from increasd malnutrition and even outright starvation. The only question, and one Americans *can* influence, is: how many millions?"

The task, then, is enormous. And the shattering domestic problems which we have been experiencing in the United States have pushed into the background the fact that 800 million people are living "barely on the margin of life" and that we face the appalling prospect of millions threatened by, and succumbing to, famine.

The conditions I have sketched will be particularly grim for the people living in what has been described as the "poorest of the poor" 30 nations by Richard Critchfield, whose latest book, *The Golden Bowl Be Broken*, published by the Indiana University Press, shows the impact of over-population on Arab Bedouins, African fishermen, Indian farmers and Indonesian urban migrants.

The "poorest of the poor" live in South Asia, where India and Ceylon face grim prospects.

They live in Africa, where five years of relentless drought resulted, last year in deaths of 100,000 people in the sub-Saharan region of West Africa known as the Sahel; and they live in the Central American-Caribbean area.

Almost a quarter of the earth's four billion population inhabits these thirty nations. Economists estimate that these countries will need an additional $3 billion annually in the next several years in order to avoid bankruptcy, social breakdown, and widespread malnutrition and famine.

We should not therefore be surprised that Mahbus Haq of the World Bank should have told a group of Members of Congress that the developing nations are growing increasingly restive and frustrated over the harsh reality that 20% of the world's population controls 80% of its resources.

Moreover, although developed nations now account for 30% of the world's population, by the year 2000, the proportion may drop to 10%.

Yet Mahbus Haq was raising not the specter of a "yellow peril" or even a "multi-hued peril." Rather he was warning of the economic consequences of the continuing accumulation of capital by a small proportion of the world population while the rest of the world grows poorer.

THE CASE OF INDIA

Let me here cite the case of India, the largest democracy in the world, as an example of what lies in store.

Here's what an Indian economist said recently:

"Economic success in this country always has amounted to keeping the wolf from the door. This year the wolf is halfway into the house."

"Of course," he added bitterly:

"Mr. Wolf will be disappointed because he will find nothing in the house to eat."

Only last week, in a special report, the Wall Street Journal noted:

For India this is a year of crushing world price pressures, shattered economic plans, rampant inflation, stagnant productivity, yawning trade and budget gaps, public anger, political violence and—most alarming of all—growing fear of approaching widespread hunger. "The only things going up these days are prices and population," an Indian economic planner says.

India is also a stark case of the difficulties developed nations will experience in attempting to help resolve some of these problems—assuming the will exists in the developed world.

The transportation system is inadequate for the delivery of food.

The bureaucracy of the country is rife with incompetence and corruption.

The continued existence of a caste system reminds us that many foreign aid programs in the past have benefitted only local elites.

Industrial capacity in India stagnants under what the Wall Street Journal termed "vicious circles" in which steel plants complain of insufficient coal, which sits outside mines because railways don't have the cars to carry it, because the plants manufacturing rolling stock complain that they have insufficient steel to build the cars.

And to all these problems that face the people of India we must add those of income redistribution, land reform and population control as well as lack of public confidence in the political process and government officials.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Although I realize fully that merely to recite the problems facing the Third World is not to solve them, I take it as given that we cannot begin effectively to attack them until we have first a clear understanding of the difficulties.

Let me now, therefore, turn to where we are today in our own country with respect to assisting the Third World and where we might be going.

It will not shock anyone who can hear me if I observe that foreign aid has been for some time unpopular on Capitol Hill.

Some Members of Congress complain of nations which have benefitted from U.S. aid, but, unappreciative, have "bitten the hand that fed them" by their willingness to accept Soviet aid as well and by not always supporting the United States' viewpoint on international issues.

Others on Capitol Hill have charged that foreign aid has been misspent on military equipment and the training of repressive police forces and not on developing industrial, technological and agricultural capabilities.

And, I confess, I share some of these criticisms, particularly the second one.

But I believe there are some steps we can take substantially to improve our development policy.

We must, first, greatly expand our programs of bilateral assistance for food and nutrition, population planning, health and education and human resources. And I am pleased to tell you that Congress last year wrote just these mandates into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973.

We must also make good on Secretary Kissinger's pledge early this month to expand U.S. technological assistance for agricultural and industrial development in the underdeveloped world.

As part of our trade policy, we must include tariff preferences for the exports of developing nations as well as most-favored nation treatment so that they can find markets for their goods.

We must seek to reverse the direction of our Food for Peace program under P. L. 480, for that program was reduced by one-third this year and the President is requesting for Fiscal 1975 a further cut of 10 percent.

Such a decrease, given the doubling of rice and other grain prices, will slash in half the food available under this program.

But, in addition to strengthening our bilateral aid programs, we must also encourage far greater participation on the part of all developed nations in multilateral developmental assistance.

In particular, we must encourage the food and oil exporting nations to pay special heed to the needs of the most vulnerable nations.

Here, I regret to note, our record in the United States is not impressive.

CONGRESS AND IDA

For, in what Robert McNamara termed "an unmitigated disaster," the House of Representatives in January defeated the Congressional authorization needed to make good on the United States' pledge of $380 million annually for the International Development Association (IDA), the soft loan window of the World Bank. These loans are used for basic development requirements of underdeveloped nations such as the farm-to-market roads, irrigation, and electrification.

Happily, earlier this week, on April 23, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved this legislation for consideration by the full Senate, and I hope the House can be persuaded to change its mind.

But I must warn you—since I presided over the debate preceding that astonishing House action—that the speeches and the votes seemed to me to be evidence of continued distaste for foreign aid, and, in particular, irritation over the Arab oil embargo and the skyrocketing price of petroleum.

The House vote demonstrated as well the continuing preoccupation of the Nixon White House with Watergate and the declining influence of the Administration.

For the President neglected to lobby for this measure when his action might have been effective, and by January his appeals held little sway, even with members of his own party.

Nevertheless, the President's April 24 Message on Foreign Aid included several significant items including, most particularly, a request for $255.3 million for the Agency for International Development, and a request for $412 million for the new Asian Development Bank.

I should tell you also that in his United Nations address, Secretary Kissinger pledged the United States to a wide-ranging multilateral effort. He promised specifically to join other governments to rebuild food reserves, to assign priority to the poor nations to help them boost their agricultural production and to attempt to increase the quantity of food aid from the United States over the level provided last year.

The Arab oil states have at least begun to acknowledge their responsibilities in this regard, by extending sizable grants and credits to other Arab nations, creating a $300 million Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, and a $125 million Fund for African Development.

Clearly, however, the newly rich nations of the Arab oil world still have much to do.

Let me add that the U.N. conference on population, scheduled to be held in Bucharest in August, and a U.N. food conference, scheduled for November in Rome, are promising opportunities to develop the kinds of action needed.

It was in large part in the hope of stimulating constructive action at these conferences that C.P. Snow, as I observed earlier, presented to Secretary General Waldheim the declaration demanding action by the governments of the world in order to prevent "severe malnutrition of hundreds of millions and death for many millions."

But if we are in fact to have such action, clearly the United States of America must lead.

THE GAP BETWEEN U.S. RHETORIC AND THE U.S. RECORD

For I must here echo the charge of the syndicated columnist, Carl T. Rowan, who called Dr. Kissinger's U.N. speech "disappointing."

Compared to the huge increases in military expenditures which the Nixon Administration requested for Fiscal 1975, and in view of the soaring prices of commodities on the world market, Dr. Kissinger's promises—and the reality quite paltry sums which Mr. Nixon is asking—fall far short of what we in this great and wealthy land should be doing in the face of burgeoning economic and nutritional disaster around the globe.

For evidence of the great gap between our rhetoric and our achievements is the following startling figure: as a percentage of Gross National Product, the United States ranks at the bottom of the industrialized nations in the amounts it gives to the International Development Association.

Or to look at it another way: of the sixteen richest countries donating funds for all development assistance, the United States ranks 14th in terms of the relative wealth it devotes to this cause.

Surely an Administration proud of its "firsts" in foreign affairs can do better—we must.

And although I have today centered my attention on the need for action now to cope with the impact on the poor nations of the sudden price rises of food, fuel, and fertilizer, I do not want for a moment to leave the impression that such action can be regarded as a substitute for solutions to the more basic problems of the world economy that leave the developing countries so vulnerable.

And, to reiterate, solutions to the progress—and survival—of these countries depend on cooperative efforts by the industrialized nations, particularly the United States, and of the newly rich Arab oil producing states.

A. SUMMARY

Let me quickly summarize.

I have told you that grave shortages of food stocks and fertilizers, high prices, rapid population growth, the energy crunch and drought in Asia and Africa are factors that spell doom for many human beings in the last third of the 20th Century.

I have told you that eight hundred million of the two billion people in 100 poor Nations of the world are subsisting on the bare margin of life.

I have told you that we in the Christian West are watching unfold one of the worst tragedies in human history as famine strikes country after country across Africa.

I have told you of the despair affecting the great country of India.

And I have told you that the hunger that stalks the lives of millions of people throughout the world must challenge the conscience of Christians everywhere.

Finally, I have told you that although the United States is beginning to respond affirmatively, we still have much to do.

Surely, therefore, it must be obvious that the churches of the affluent, industrialized nations have a responsibility—a religious responsibility—to encourage the governments of their countries to adopt more civilized and enlightened policies toward the poor nations.

And in this connection, I think of the message I heard last summer in Geneva on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the World Council of Churches.

Here is part of what that message, prepared by the Central Committee of the Council, said:

In the Gospel of Luke, Jesus begins his ministry by speaking of the nature of the kingdom, quoting the words of the prophet: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor."

But, the document continues by observing that today: there is bad news for the poor all over the world—they are getting poorer. Those who are oppressed in today's world have little or no hope of liberation.

And, the message concludes:

There is therefore no doubt that our task as partners with Christ is a world historical

task, a public, political responsibility since it concerns his kingdom. The whole of life and the whole of mankind is the sphere of our calling. . . . It is therefore biblically right and proper that the World Council and its member churches should be concerned about poverty, oppression, blindness and despair everywhere.

This is why I have no hesitation in urging upon each of you, whether clergy or layman, a course of political action motivated by your religious concern.

You should be, first, getting in touch with your elected Senators and Representatives.

You should tell them that a humane and peaceful world depends in large measure upon the compassionate and constructive response of the government of the United States to the deprivation and despair that confront so many of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and South and Central America.

You should tell them that economic and political common sense requires their support of a wise and far-sighted development policy.

And you should tell them that justice and the demands of the Christian conscience requires their action.

But you will also, I hope, as United Methodists, as Christians, also be witnesses within your own communities on behalf of the poor of the world—the ministers among you in your sermons; the laymen among you in your several callings.

For, in the words once again of the Gospel of Luke:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, and set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

TRANSIT NEEDS OF DADE COUNTY, FLA.

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the 29th, the distinguished mayor of Dade County, Fla., a metropolitan government of the Greater Miami area, Hon. John B. Orr, Jr., appeared before the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress and made an exceptionally able presentation concerning the need for public transit in Dade County, Fla. and the necessity of very substantial Federal assistance in making such transit possible.

Mayor Orr pointed out what would be the effect of an adequate public transit system upon the environment, conservation of energy, the desirable development of the area, increasing the number of jobs, and the distribution of income. Mayor Orr also ably defined the requisites of an effective public transit system. It was Mayor Orr's opinion and the opinion of other distinguished mayors who appeared with him that the Federal Government should contribute at least two-thirds of the cost of the establishment of effective public transit systems in the urban areas of our country—the other one-third or a lesser amount to be borne by the urban areas or by them and their respective States.

Mayor Orr and the other important mayors emphasized how the cities of the country had relied upon the Federal Government providing 80 percent of the cost of providing effective public transit in the cities and many of them had made commitments upon that assumption which unhappily the Federal Government shows no prospect of meeting.

Mayor Orr's statement upon this critical subject will be informative and stimulating to all who read it. I, therefore, include Mayor Orr's statement in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

(Statement of the Honorable John B. Orr, Jr., Mayor of Miami-Dade County, Fla.)

PUBLIC TRANSIT IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Urbanized Dade County is an American city, built this century, of 1.3 million, with relatively low density development spread in a long thin pattern along the coast coral ridge. Though there is a downtown, the Central Business District of Miami, it provides only 8% of the jobs. There are 12 other main employment centers scattered throughout the urbanized area.

The County has completed its urban freeways. These roads are badly overcrowded. In 1972, there were at least 50 miles of arterial streets and freeways carrying 150% of their designed capacity, and at least 100 other miles of arterials carrying 115% of capacity. Since 1972, vehicle registration and gasoline consumption, and therefore miles driven, have increased 18%, and almost no new roads have been opened. This overcrowding reduces speed and increases accidents. In rush hours, the average automobile speed is 11–12 m.p.h.

The bus system is publicly owned and has been gradually improving service. But buses currently do not provide adequate transportation. The running times are slow—their average speed is 11 m.p.h.—and service between many points is not available.

We have a transportation "problem" in Dade County. Mobility is limited, inefficient, slow and expensive. The large elderly population, many of whom cannot drive, and the poor and the young who do not have cars, are severely restricted in their mobility. Our transportation facilities consume too much space—40% of the Central Business District—consume too much fuel, and cause rising levels of air and noise pollution.

In trying to solve our transportation problem, we set out the following objectives for public transportation:

1. TRANSPORTATION

We want to enable all residents and visitors to travel to all points in the urban area safely, with a reasonable expenditure of time and money. We are especially concerned about mobility for the elderly, the infirm, the young, the poor and visitors.

2. ENVIRONMENT

We intend to reduce air and noise pollution caused by transportation and to minimize the amount of land surface devoted to transportation. We intend to keep our air within the federal ambient air quality standards.

3. ENERGY

We want to reduce fuel consumption while improving mobility. During the gasoline shortage in the winter of 1974, our area had a 38% shortfall. We are especially dependent on imported oil and oil products. We would like, at the least, for the increase in fuel consumption to lag behind population growth. We aim for an absolute reduction in fuel consumption.

4. DEVELOPMENT

We intend for public transportation to influence development patterns toward the following goals:

(a) Urban sprawl should be contained and shaped into efficient service units.

(b) Vacant land between fragmented residential areas should be developed and population densities surrounding urban cores should be increased.

(c) Declining urban areas should be revitalized, the spread of blight should be stopped, and slums and decay should be eliminated. (In this regard, it would be well to remember that surveys showed two of the main causes of the Watts riot were the physical isolation of the area and the absence of public transportation.)

(d) We intend for improved public transportation to facilitate the dispersal of racial and ethnic ghettoes.

5. ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

Improved public transportation should make more jobs accessible to more people.

6. INCOME REDISTRIBUTION

Today it is the poor who ride the buses. The improvement of transit will increase the value of this good to these riders. Since we will finance these improvements by *ad valorem* property taxes and by federal income taxes, and will not raise the fare, there will be a redistribution of income.

We aim for and project a six-fold increase over current public transportation ridership.

We have specific standards for the near term improvement of bus service:

(a) Provision of bus service countywide, with bus route spacing determined by population density and auto ownership levels;

(b) Seat availibility to all express service patrons, and to all local route patrons except during peak hours;

(c) Guaranteed bus service at least every hour on all routes, and local bus service at least every 20 minutes during the peak period;

(d) Assurance that a high percentage of buses operate on time—at least 90% on most routes;

(e) Operation of unprofitable routes, subject to specific patronage criteria;

(f) Maintenance of the current 30¢ bus fare;

(g) Evaluation of Dade County transit performance against other systems nationwide on a periodic basis.

In measuring solutions to our transportation problem by our objectives, we determined that we cannot put additional reliance on the automobile. Even assuming a massive switch to smaller cars, and economical non-polluting engines, reliance on the automobile would fail to meet our objectives in the following particulars:

(a) We would need more roads and therefore more land. Smaller cars reduce congestion to some degree, but no increase in traffic could be accommodated on existing roads.

(b) Noise pollution would be increased.

(c) Fuel efficiency, though improved, could not approach the levels that public transit can attain.

(d) The transportation needs of the elderly, the infirm, the poor and the young will not be met.

We decided upon a system with the following components:

(a) A 53.7 mile rapid transit system operating on an exclusive guideway with 54 stations serving the major travel desires of county residents.

(b) A system of trunk line bus routes operating on expressways and arterial streets to serve areas of the county not directly served by rapid transit.

(c) A network of feeder bus routes complementing the trunk line bus routes and serving rapid transit stations.

(d) "Mini-systems" within major traffic generating areas providing increased circulation and distribution to nearby rapid transit stations.

We chose this form of public transportation by a cost/benefit approach that considered speed, capacity, safety, noise and air pollution, comfort, fuel consumption and usefulness to the infirm and elderly.

1. Cost

(a) Guideway vs. Freeways

Fixed guideways are cheaper than freeways. Four lane urban freeways in Dade

County cost $75 million per mile. A tracked system would cost $12 million per mile including stations. We are looking at a new technology employing overhead cables that can be put in place for $1 million per mile, exclusive of stations.

(b) Guideways vs. Buses

If an exclusive guideway were built for buses, it would need to be 40' wide, compared to 22' for rail. The capital costs would be comparable.

The rail cars cost more than buses. Our 380 vehicles will cost $225,000 each, and will seat about 70. A new bus today costs $38,000 and seats about 50. The rail car will be depreciated over 20 years while the bus has an economic life of only 10. Nevertheless, the rail car costs $160 per seat per year while the bus costs about $85.

While capital costs are higher, operating costs will be lower for a fixed guideway system.

An automated rail system will cost only 41% of what buses cost to operate—46¢ per vehicle mile compared to $1.11 for buses. The rail vehicles are substantially larger than buses. The reason for this is the labor intensiveness of buses. When you add capacity, you add drivers to the same extent. Labor costs are 61¢ of the bus costs of $1.11 per mile. With rail, labor costs are 56% of rail operations, 26¢ of 46¢.

2. Capacity

A four lane freeway can carry 10,000 persons per hour, assuming a normal mix of buses and cars. A fixed guideway system can transport 15,000 persons per hour. We project a need for a capacity of 13,500 persons per hour at several points.

3. Speed

The average speed of a rail system can be 23 m.p.h., with no reduction in rush hour. The average speed for all buses now is 11 m.p.h. This is reduced somewhat in rush hours. Bus speeds can be improved on some routes by making express lanes and bus-only lanes, but the opportunities are limited. Without exclusive guideways, buses must use city streets to pick up and discharge passengers. The average automobile speed is 23 m.p.h., but in rush hour this is lowered to the 11–12 m.p.h. level of buses.

Currently, the bus trip the length of Miami Beach takes one hour. Guideway transit can schedule 18 minutes. There is little opportunity for improving bus schedules on this route. Miami Beach to downtown Miami now takes 45 minutes by bus. The transit will take less than 20.

4. Service

Fixed guideway cars are smoother in ride and are roomier. They are easier for the infirm because there are no steps.

5. Pollution

With present technology, buses cause far more air pollution and the multiple sources make abatement difficult. An electric system produces pollution at only one source, so reduction is simplified. Bus pollution is emitted where people are, while electric generation emissions are generally away from concentrations of people.

Buses can never be as quiet as the rail cars. With a rail or cable system, the source of noise is removed from the pedestrians and residences.

Cars will always produce more noise pollution, even if engines can be made clean.

6. Land use

Freeways use four times as much land as a fixed guideway. The new cable technology can utilize existing right of way requiring very little new land. Guideways for buses need to be wider than for rail.

7. Safety

The national experience is that rail transit has half of the accidental injury rate of bus transit. Cars are the most dangerous form of transportation.

8. Fuel consumption

All public transportation is far more economical than the private car. We did not see a substantive difference between bus and rail. Electric power can be based on a variety of fuels.

We are aware of the conventional wisdom that fixed guideway systems can only work where there are highly concentrated Central Business Districts and high density residential development. We are convinced that only a fixed guideway system can achieve the speed, service and environmental characteristics necessary for success in our area according to our objectives.

RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, CHAIRMAN, URBAN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE, NOT COVERED IN THE FORMAL STATEMENT

The Metro Transit Authority operates buses on 15.3 million route miles per year, carrying 54.6 million passengers. Ridership was up 3.3% in FY 1971–72 over the prior year. This was the first increase since a fare rise in 1968.

The subsidy for FY 1973–74 is $4,025,000, an increase of 27% over the $3,170,000 in FY 1972–73. The sources for the subsidy are as follows:

Seven cent gas tax	$2,950,000
Federal revenue sharing	1,000,000
Mini bus (general operating fund)	75,000
Total	4,025,000

Since it is intended to hold the 30¢ fare and since that fare does not cover operating costs, increases in service will probably entail increased subsidies.

At the present time, a high percentage of public transit riders are the poor, the elderly, the young and visitors. Ten percent of bus riders are non-residents. We intend to improve transportation services for these rider groups and to attract riders from new groups.

ALWAYS SEARCHING FOR GOALS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital ladies of the Greater Miami area, indeed Florida and the country, is Ruth Kassewitz, director of communications for the Metro Government of Dade County and wife of Jack Kassewitz, chief editorial writer of the Miami News. Mrs. Kassewitz is a dynamic lady who has had an exciting career in civic affairs, in business, and in government; also as a wife and mother. One thing that distinguishes her, as a friend says, is that she is always learning, always searching for higher goals. Mr. Kassewitz is a stimulating example of women who can be a lovely lady, a good wife and mother, and yet have a distinguished career and contribute much to the betterment of her community, State, and country. Mr. Speaker, I include the very interesting article appearing in the March 3, 1974, issue of the Coral Gables Times-Guide about Mrs. Kassewitz in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

SHE IS ALWAYS LEARNING, SEARCHING FOR GOALS

(By Annette Brin)

When people say they believe that everything happens for a reason, there is at least one woman in Coral Gables who would certainly agree. Her name is Ruth Kassewitz, director of communications for Metro.

She graduated from Ohio State University in 1951 with a major in journalism management—a split between journalism and business administration.

Following graduation Mrs. Kassewitz took a job as copy writer with Ohio Field Gas Company. She was in charge of producing material for the print media.

After a time she moved to Kansas City and began working with an advertising agency dealing with car sales, road equipment and fork lift trucks.

During this period one of the "bridges" in Mrs. Kassewitz' life began to build which ultimately led her to Dade County.

"My grandfather many years ago purchased the Magnolia Arcade in St. Petersburg," she said, "and my dad always wanted to come to Florida. Unfortunately, he died before realizing his dream. But my brother Dick, while I was in Kansas, decided to transfer to the University of Florida from Ohio State University. He later married and moved to Daytona."

During a two week vacation in Florida, supposedly to visit her brother and sister-in-law, Mrs. Kassewitz actively sought out new employment. She landed a job with Grant Advertising and in 1956 moved to Miami.

"Grant did a lot of work for Florida Power and Light," she recalled, "and I had to learn to write about electricity. It was quite a switch from my old days with the gas company."

She worked for the Grant agency for two and a half years, during which time she switched from FP&L copy and found herself doing a great deal of public relations work in other areas of the Grant operation.

"When FP&L asked me to come back and write copy for them I declined, realizing that I loved the extroverted atmosphere of public relations," she said.

She joined the Florida Public Relations Associates, The Advertising Club of Greater Miami and Women in Communications (formerly Theta Sigma Phi), when her interest in public relations was triggered. In 1959 she became the first woman to serve on the board of directors for the Advertising Club of Greater Miami.

In 1960 she became an Account Executive with Buildorama under Venn-Cole and Associates and worked with her first secretary. Together they put out a bilingual newsletter. It was during this time that she met her husband—Jack Kassewitz, now chief editorial writer for The Miami News.

"That was in 1961," she recalled. "I used to walk into The Miami News with stories. I was awed by the size of the city rooms in both The Miami Herald and The News. Jack used to sit near the entrance when I walked in and he always had such a bright smile and friendly hello. He was in charge of one of the paper's special sections at the time."

Later in 1962, Jack began courting Ruth. He proposed to her in Palm Beach while she was in charge of the Parade of Homes through Buildorama.

"He used to come up and see me and during the weekend of the opening he proposed." On July 28, 1962, Ruth became Mrs. Jack Kassewitz.

Later Bill Venn began his own corporation and Mrs. Kassewitz became an executive vice president in the Venn Corporation. One of her last responsibilities while with the corporation was handling public relations with concerns in the Bahamas. This began construction of still yet another "bridge" in her life.

It was during this time that she met architect Ed Grafton, then president of the American Institute of Architects. In 1969 Grafton offered her a position as Director of Communications in his firm. Her job was to promote his work locally, which included the Dade School Board, Miami-Dade Community College and more significantly for Mrs. Kassewitz, HUD.

"Ed was busy working with the then Model

Cities Director Gordon Johnson to get funding for the project," Mrs. Kassewitz said. "They were up against a deadline and needed someone to coordinate the material and have it ready on time. I was selected. I hired several Kelly Girls and together we typed the paperwork and got it off to Atlanta."

Her efficient handling of the Model Cities paperwork was never forgotten and later Johnson asked her to become the first Director of Communications for HUD.

"I created their department," she said. "It was a marvelous challenge and a great position. The information I learned during those two years was invaluable."

County Manager Ray Goode met Mrs. Kassewitz during this time and when he decided that Metro needed its own office of communications, Mrs. Kassewitz was asked to head the department, crossing another "bridge."

"This position is the most challenging I have ever held," she said. "Feeling as I do that Metro is doing a good job for the people, it is not difficult for me to attempt to convey this to the people. The methods and wherefores, however, are a challenge."

Although her husband's job and her position could cause conflict in many homes. Mrs. Kassewitz said that this has never been a problem in their lives. Neither have their different religious backgrounds. Mrs. Kassewitz belongs to the Plymouth Congregational Church. Jack Kassewitz is Jewish.

"I work hard for my church and Jack attends our 'stately' events. At other times we go to synagogue together. I think our marriage has helped to unite a lot of people of varying backgrounds."

Always learning and searching for higher goals, Mrs. Kassewitz is now president of the University of Miami Women's Guild.

"I just believe that I should be active in my community," she said.

ENERGY NEEDS: THE DILEMMA AND THE OPTIONS

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the pages of this RECORD in the past several years have been stuffed with information on the energy crisis and related matters. I would hope by this time that Members of this body would feel as I do that the available information has been aired publicly and that considerable discretion should be used in adding to that compilation. The more recent entries in the RECORD concerning energy have rightfully called for action rather than continued debate.

Nevertheless, from time to time one finds that a particular article, speech, or editorial states perhaps more succinctly than earlier writings the real heart of the problem that must be addressed. I have found that the recent article, "The Hard Energy Choices Ahead," by Dr. Ralph Lapp in the April 23, 1974, Wall Street Journal, is a scholarly and well-considered presentation of the dilemma with which we are faced and the realistic alternatives that lie before us. Dr. Lapp's article is one of practicality and good sense. It is quite unlike some of the writings which are quite plentiful these days by persons whose heads are in the clouds and who proclaim that our salvation lies in the immediate utilization of windmills floating in the Atlantic, solar panels coverings of our Southwestern States and burning of garbage and other waste materials to make up our electrical energy deficits. I am not saying that some of these approaches should not be considered and do not have their proper place. I suspect that some portion of our future electrical needs may well be filled by the utilization of such longer range developments. Our most immediate needs, however, cannot be solved by research and development. They must be solved by utilization not only of proven techniques but techniques which our industrial capability can bring into reality—in the form of operating electric powerplants—in rather short order. In large part, therefore, we must depend upon coal and nuclear power to compensate for oil shortages which we have experienced recently and which in all likelihood we will continue to experience.

I commend to my colleagues this fine article by Dr. Lapp:

THE HARD ENERGY CHOICES AHEAD

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

The United States is entering a disquieting new era in its economic history. We are moving out of an era when energy was easy to find and easy to exploit—a fundamental development whose implications will reach well into the 21st Century.

The Arab oil embargo has ended, the long lines at the service stations have disappeared at least temporarily and the short-run "energy crisis" has eased. Yet we remain an energy-short nation even now and the long-run trends are not comforting. An analysis of this nation's future energy needs leads inevitably to these conclusions:

—There is no way we can meet the self-sufficiency goals of "Project Independence" by President Nixon's 1980 deadline, and probably not even by 1985. Dependence on foreign oil will be a brutal fact of life for at least a decade, more likely two.

—There is no way we can sustain the giddy growth rates in energy consumption of recent years. Even under the best of circumstances energy conservation is going to be mandatory. We are going to have to adapt our transportation system—indeed our whole system of generating and using energy—to an age of energy scarcity, and this will require a whole series of profound political and economic adjustments.

—There is no alternative, in the long run, to primary reliance for our energy needs upon coal and atomic power. Simultaneously, we are going to have to move toward an "all-electric" economy, perhaps even to the extent of eventually substituting electric automobiles for gasoline-burning ones.

Increasing U.S. energy consumption has accompanied a growing Gross National Product for well over a decade. Last year the U.S. consumed an amount of energy equivalent to the heat produced by burning 3 billion tons of high-rank coal or 13 billion barrels of oil. Actual oil consumption in 1973 amounted to 6.3 billion barrels; add to this the natural gas consumed and it develops that 77 percent of our energy was delivered in the form of pumpable fuels.

GROWTH EVERY YEAR

Last year our energy consumption increased 4.8 percent over that of the year before, and consumption increased 4.9 percent the year before that. If we were to continue growing at this rate, then in 1984 we would be using the energy equivalent of 24 billion barrels of oil annually. Of course, we could get some of this energy from non-petroleum sources, but even so, we would need some 11.6 billion barrels of petoleum products in 1985.

There is no way we can get those 11.6 billion barrels, unless the Arabs decide to act against their own self-interest and authorize greatly stepped-up production at low prices. There is no way we can get even the 9.5 billion barrels that the National Petroleum Council estimates we will need in 1985. And there is no easy way we can make up the difference out of U.S. resources, either. America, to repeat, has run out of easy energy sources. It must now grapple with the tough choices.

What are those choices? Although our petroleum resources are not fully exploited, they hold little promise of keeping pace with demand. This means we must now look to coal, lignite and oil shale, all of which, unfortunately, must be mined. Mining, of course, entails many problems—not the least of which is the sheer volume of earth which will have to be moved. For example, production of 1 billion barrels of synthetic crude oil from oil shale would require mining and processing 1.7 billion tons of the shale, not to mention disposing of the talc-like waste. By way of comparison, the U.S. coal industry mines only about 0.6 billion tons annually.

The Fort Union Formation in the Upper Missouri Basin holds a vast treasure of sub-bituminous coal, some of it reaching 100 feet or more in bed thickness. Luckily, it's low in sulfur and is quite close to the surface; and, because coal is a close chemical cousin to oil, it can be liquefied and/or gasified.

But will a Northern Plains state like Montana allow the industrialization that could convert it into a new Texas on the U.S. energy map? Can the necessary water be found to operate huge synthetic fuel plants? What price-per-barrel has to be assured the synthetic fuel industry to attract the necessary capital? What should be the use of the coal which is now being unit-train shipped to midwestern electric utilities? Who decides what fraction of the coal goes to boilers in steam-electric plants and what goes to making gasoline or aircraft fuels? These are critical questions for the nation's energy future.

But here's an even more fundamental question: Just what is an "allowable" annual growth rate in energy consumption? Our present growth rate of nearly 5% a year simply cannot be sustained. On the other hand, a "zero growth" policy, advocated by some environmentalists, would have an economy-wrecking potential.

Rather arbitrarily, I have calculated that each barrel of oil (or its energy equivalent) is linked to about $100 of Gross National Product. If so, a cutback of 1 billion barrels in annual oil consumption would mean a $100 billion dent in the GNP. Of course, this is a grossly simplified calculation, but it does indicate the scope and painfulness of the economic decisions we are going to have to make.

Detroit's monomania for the super-horsepower engine, coupled with the fuel robbery perpetrated by lowered compression ratios and air pollution controls, has contributed mightily to our fuel crisis. Yet with so much of the nation's well-being linked to the motor car, we can hardly afford to dislocate our economy by precipitous, ill-considered responses. Nor can we let environmental considerations alone dominate policymaking for such things as transportation, the location of power plants and the development of energy resources. I believe the much-publicized Environmental Impact Statement must be replaced by a "Triple E" statement that strikes a balance between environmental, economic and energy considerations.

SHIFT TO LIGHTER CARS

It seems obvious, however, that for the nation to live within its energy means, Detroit must at least shift to lighter, higher-performance cars. I see no reason why Detroit cannot continue to increase unit sales, adding 25 million more vehicles to the car population by 1980—provided the gasoline mileage goes up to an average of 18 miles per gallon. This would allow full mobility for Americans—that is, 10,000 miles per vehicle-year—while consuming no more fuel

than automobiles did in 1973. It would, however, mean flushing the low-performance cars out of circulation.

Similarly, it is obvious that the air cargo business cannot rocket ahead on the vertiginous growth rate of past decades. Shipping cargo by air is energy lunacy, much more wasteful of fuel than transporting things by rail, measured on a ton-mile basis. Trucks, too, are less efficient than trains. Inevitably, we must return to the rails, and this will require a national metamorphosis that will occupy the remaining decades of this century.

The fact that the United States is running out of pumpable fuels places high priority on central station generation of power, using either solid fossil fuels or uranium. Next year about 30% of all U.S. fuel consumption will be directed to electric energy generation and this is expected to grow to 50% by the end of the century. By then, up to 60% of all electric generation is projected to come from nuclear power sources—from 1,000 nuclear stations. By the year 2000, uranium should be substituting for the annual burn-up of more than 2 billion tons of coal.

Atomic power raises environmental and safety issues which must be faced. But for anyone concerned about the ravages of strip-mining, it also offers immense advantages over coal and oil shale. In fact, once the power-breeder reactor comes on line, it will be possible to coast through the entire 21st Century without mining a single ton of uranium ore; industry will merely rework ore already mined and tap the full potential of the atom.

As we move toward massive reliance upon coal and atomic energy, we also will move toward an all-electric economy. Unlike oil and gasoline, which can be distributed easily for utilization in automobile engines and other small power plants, coal and atomic energy lend themselves best to exploitation in central power plants. If advances in electric batteries or other methods of storing energy make the electric car a reality, each garage in effect, will become a private filling station, with the car charged up there overnight for use the next day.

The U.S. energy economy is so often projected only as far as the year 2000 that people overlook the energy requirements of the next century. Whereas this century will be reckoned by energy historians as 90% fossil and 10% nuclear, the relationship will become increasingly nuclear in the future. Although it's unlikely that 21st Century Americans will be free to waste energy the way we have, many experts think that the U.S. population will grow very slowly in the next century and not exceed 400 million by the year 2100. Thus, I would expect that total energy consumption would no more than triple in the next century and that nuclear sources could maintain a viable U.S. energy economy through the 21st Century.

A BLEAK PICTURE

The world-wide energy picture, on the other hand, is very bleak. The "easy energy" sources of other nations should run out rather soon in the 21st Century. The proved reserve of 500 billion barrels of oil in the Persian Gulf may seem immense, but it cannot satisfy the rising energy expectations of developing countries for very long. The run-out of "easy energy" and the on-set of "tough energy" could have revolutionary consequences for the growth of the planet's population. Merely feeding the growing populations of underdeveloped nations may eventually impose energy requirements that many nations will not be able to meet. Nor will many of these nations be able to afford the U.S. solution: a highly-electric economy designed to mate with nuclear power. Result—a widening of the gap between the have and have-not nations.

I have found that in lecturing about the subject of future energy supply people discount rather gloomy forecasts as these by saying that "scientists will come up with a solution!" There are, of course, a number of energy options already in sight, but all have their drawbacks. None qualify as "easy energy," especially if all costs are reckoned, and it is this advent of "tough energy" that has such fundamental significance to our future way of life.

DEATH OF THE HONORABLE CARL DURHAM

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I report the passing yesterday of a man who served for a great many years in the House of Representatives as a Representative of the Sixth District of North Carolina, the Honorable Carl Thomas Durham. Carl Durham came to the Congress in 1939 and served with distinction as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs—later the House Armed Services Committee—and on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Cary Durham was one of the original members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when it was founded in August of 1946. He served as the chairman of the Joint Committee during the 82d and 85th Congresses. He was vice chairman of the committee during the 81st, 84th, and 86th Congresses.

Carl Durham was born in Orange County, N.C., on August 28, 1892. He was graduated in 1917 from the University of North Carolina majoring in pharmacy. He served in the Navy during World War I as a pharmacist's mate. After returning to civilian life, Carl Durham could be found behind the pharmacy counter of Eubank's in Chapel Hill dispensing pharmaceuticals, smoking his ever-present pipe and providing sound counseling to the students of the University. For many years, Carl Durham served the people of Chapel Hill as a pharmacist, as a member of the City Commission and in other capacities. In the late 1930's someone suggested to the "Doc" that he run for Congress. He did this and was elected to the 76th Congress in 1939 and to the succeeding Congresses through the 86th. In 1960, of his own volition, he elected to retire from the Congress and return to his native North Carolina to enjoy peace, serenity, and the good fellowship of his lifelong friends.

I had the privilege of serving with Carl Durham over a period of 14 years during which I learned to know the man and to respect his keen sense of judgment and his unparalleled ability as a legislator. On September 1, 1960, I stood on this floor and delivered a tribute to Carl Durham upon his retirement citing the important contributions which he made to our country and in particular to its military posture through his many years of work on the Armed Services Committee. My esteemed colleague was an outstanding statesman. His efforts in the field of defense provided the foundation for our security. Our successes in the early days of the development of nuclear energy were largely due to the leadership Carl Durham provided. His vision in getting the initial steps started in the cooperative development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for all of mankind was clear. He, for example, was the one who managed the passage of the EURATOM Act here in this Chamber. This act was passed in 1958 and made it possible for us to work jointly with European nations to develop many peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This included nuclear power which is now the hope of Europe and many nations to counteract the world petroleum problems with which we are faced. A grateful Nation mourns the passage of this great man.

All of us who knew Carl Durham will miss him. I know of no finer gentleman who has ever served the Congress. He was known by all as a gentleman and a person about whom many said he surely has not an enemy in the world. All who have known him have benefited from that experience.

Carl Durham was active in his retirement. He continued to keep in touch with many of us in the Congress. Every now and then a number of us would gratefully receive a note from him containing some sage advice on issues we had before us. We were all proud to know him. He was a very patriotic man who served his Nation unstintingly. Our country owes a great tribute to Carl Durham for his services. We shall miss him as will his family, the many graduates of the university who partook of his counsel during their study years, as well as the many members of the faculty of the university. We all join in mourning his passing.

I want to especially convey my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Durham and the children. I know the deep sorrow they are experiencing. I hope the sorrow they must bear is somewhat ameliorated by the reminiscences of a life with a great and compassionate person. Theirs is a justified and a unique pride which I hope will be a source of deep satisfaction to each one of them.

HANS MORGENTHAU'S ADVICE TO SECRETARY OF STATE HENRY KISSINGER

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, recently I was visited by a spokesman for the National Committee on American Foreign Policy, an organization chaired by the distinguished Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau. For the RECORD, I am submitting an open letter to Secretary of State Henry Kissinger signed by Professor Morgenthau which cautions against "phoney détente" and urges careful review of American foreign policy. I share the concerns of Professor Morgenthau:

AN OPEN LETTER TO SECRETARY KISSINGER

The popular conception of détente has created the illusion that the United States and the Soviet Union are working hand-in-hand throughout the world. This is certainly not the case in the Middle East. Under cover of détente, the Soviets have not missed an opportunity to expand their sphere of influence and power throughout the eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

Last October, the Soviet Union was aware of the impending Arab attack on Israel and did not inform the United States, as it was

obligated to do by the Brezhnev-Nixon agreement. Furthermore, the Soviet Union incited the Arab states, not involved in the original attack, to join in the war. It has urged the oil-producing Arab states to continue the embargo against the United States.

It is in the context of these realities that we should judge the new American posture in the Middle East, which has been shifting in a pro-Arab direction. However, such a policy is up against the unchanged objective of all Arab states, "moderate" as well as radical, to destroy Israel.

The risk with which that new policy confronts both the United States and Israel lies in the ability of the Soviet Union to outbid the United States in supporting the Arabs against Israel, the only democratic and reliably anti-Soviet force in the Middle East. It thereby would compel the United States into pressuring Israel to make ever more far-reaching concessions until its very existence would be jeopardized.

It is against this danger that the United States must guard. It must refrain from exerting pressures which can only lead to Israel's piecemeal dismemberment. The fate of Czechoslovakia after the Munich Settlement of 1938 comes to mind. We must not pursue a policy of peace at any price, blind to Arab and Soviet objectives. If the Soviet Union can compete successfully with the United States for the Arabs' favor only at the price of Israel's destruction, it will not hesitate to help the Arabs attain that objective. Already, it appears that the Soviets are re-arming the Arab armies on a massive scale.

Genuine peace, like genuine détente, imposes restraints on both sides; phony détente can be used by one side as a cover behind which to do the other side in.

Respectfully,

Prof. HANS J. MORGENTHAU,
Chairman, National Committee on American Foreign Policy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SIKES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GRAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. METCALFE, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. CORMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CORMAN, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYATT.
Mr. HANRAHAN.
Mr. MCCLORY in three instances.
Mr. ARCHER in two instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. FREY.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.
Mr. WYDLER.
Mr. RINALDO.
Mr. HOGAN.
Mr. HUDNUT.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York.
Mr. FROEHLICH.
Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.
Mr. CRANE in five instances.
Mr. SYMMS.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.
Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina.
Mr. LANDGREBE.
Mr. HUBER in two instances.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. MARAZITI.
Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in 10 instances.
Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.
Ms. HOLTZMAN in 10 instances.
Mr. BURTON.
Mr. SIKES in five instances.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
Mr. GRAY in two instances.
Mr. O'NEILL.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. HICKS.
Mr. CAREY of New York.
Mr. MACDONALD.
Mr. COTTER in 10 instances.
Mr. FASCELL in five instances.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. HUNGATE.
Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.
Mr. MURTHA in two instances.
Mr. GINN.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1647. An act to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2254. A letter from the Chairman, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Authority, covering calendar year 1973, together with financial statements for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to Public Law 89–774; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2255. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the final report of his investigation of youth camp safety, pursuant to section 602 of Public Law 92–318; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2256. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the National Health Service Corps and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2257. A letter from the Director of Federal Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting a report for the month of February 1974, on the average number of passengers per day on board each train operated, and the on-time performance at the final destination of each train operated, by route and by railroad, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 548(a)(2); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2258. A letter from the Director of Federal Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting a report for the month of March 1974, on the average number of passengers per day on board each train operated, and the on-time performance at the final destination of each train operated, by route and by railroad, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 548 (a)(2); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2259. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the employment and compensation of employees of the White House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2260. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, submitting a report on St. Lucie Inlet, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 93–294); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2261. A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, by revising provisions relating to the payment of monetary benefits to persons under legal disability, including minors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11691. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1935 (commonly referred to as the "Miller Act"), to provide for the inclusion of interest and legal fees in judgments granted on suits by subcontractors based upon payment bonds, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–1015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1079. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6175. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute on Aging, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–1016). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 1080. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12993. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that licenses for the operation of broadcasting stations may be issued and renewed for terms of 4 years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–1017). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1081. Resolution providing for the consideration of a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the national cancer program and to authorize appropriations for such program for the next 3 fiscal years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–1018). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1082. Resolution providing for the consideration of a bill to provide for means of dealing with energy shortages by requiring reports with respect to energy resources, by providing for temporary suspension of certain air pollution requirements, by providing for coal conversion, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–1019). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRASER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 14291. A bill to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 to permit U.S. participation in international enforcement of fish conservation in additional geographic areas, pursuant to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–1020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 14462. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of oil and gas production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 14463. A bill to establish in the State of California the Madrona Marsh National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14464. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 10-year delimiting period for the pursuit of educational programs by veterans, wives, and widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 14465. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit discrimination on account of age in credit card transactions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14466. A bill to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act Amendments of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 14467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 14468. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to fund and establish a nonprofit National Environmental Policy Institute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 14469. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American folklife center in the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 14470. A bill to authorize payments to any small business which suffers financial loss because customer access to such business is interferred with by certain Federal urban development projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 14471. A bill to amend the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 to allow adequate time for citizen participation in public hearings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 14472. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, to provide an annuity for the dependents of persons who perform the service required under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, and die before being granted retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina):

H.R. 14473. A bill to prohibit the exportation of fertilizer from the United States until the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an adequate domestic supply of fertilizer exists; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mrs. BOGGS, Mrs. BURKE of California, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 14474. A bill to provide for additional Federal financial participation in expenses incurred in providing benefits to Indians, Aleuts, native Hawaiians, and other aboriginal persons, under certain State public assistance programs established pursuant to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALFE:

H.R. 14475. A bill to establish in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a direct low-interest loan program to assist low- and middle-income homeowners in the maintenance and improvement of their homes, and to provide for an annual GAO audit of the housing programs of such Department to promote their more efficient administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 14476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for dependents, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 14477. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third-party payee) in certain cases, and to continue on a permanent basis the provision making supplemental security income recipients eligible for food stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 14478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption for $750 for members of a volunteer fire company, ambulance team, first aid corps or rescue squad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SIKES, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. FISHER, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H.R. 14479. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall be deemed lawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 14480. A bill to amend the Par Value Modification Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 14481. A bill to prescribe uniform criteria for formulating judicial remedies for the elimination of dual school systems; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BRAY, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. RARICK, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 14482. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of certain Federal courts with respect to public schools and to confer such jurisdiction upon certain other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 14483. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts to issue busing orders based on race, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14484. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide for freedom of choice in student assignments in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 14485. A bill to extend the appropriation authorization for reporting of weather modification activities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COTTER, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 14486. A bill making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for research on the cause and treatment of diabetes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 14487. A bill to provide that no part of expenses or depreciation on a taxpayer's personal residence can be deducted for income tax purposes as a business expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. LENT, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 14488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate, in the case of any oil or gas well located outside the United States, the percentage depletion allowance and the option to deduct intangible drilling and development costs, and to deny a foreign tax credit with respect to the income derived from such well; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 14489. A bill to prohibit for a temporary period the exportation of ferrous scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REUSS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. J. WIL-

LIAM STANTON, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H.R. 14490. A bill to establish a program of community development block grants, to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 14491. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENHOLM:

H.R. 14492. A bill to amend the Emergency Highway Energy Conservation Act to provide for a national highway speed limit of 65 miles per hour; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 14493. A bill to protect the right of privacy of individuals concerning whom identifiable information is recorded by the Federal Government by enacting principles to govern Federal agency information practices; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 14494. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and other statutes to increase to $10,000 the maximum amount eligible for use of simplified procedures in procurement of property and services by the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. REES, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Ms. BURKE of California):

H.R. 14495. A bill to amend the Mineral Lands Leasing Act to advance oil shale research and development by establishing a Government-industry corporation to further the technology required for commercial development of nonnuclear in situ processing of oil shale resources located within the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. GROSS, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOGAN, Miss JORDAN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. MIZELL):

H.R. 14496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FREY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SISK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H.R. 14497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. BOWEN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. HANRAHAN):

H.R. 14498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 14499. A bill to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14500. A bill to reenact, amend and extend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14501. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to determine if bounties, grants, or export subsidies are paid by foreign countries with respect to dairy products imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 993. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of a citizen to hold the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 994. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., and Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri):

H. Res. 1075. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FROEHLICH:

H. Res. 1076. Resolution to amend the House rules to require that the report of each House committee on each public bill or joint resolution reported by the committee shall contain a statement as to the inflationary impact on the national economy of the enactment of such legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANN:

H. Res. 1077. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. TREEN, Mr. LENT, and Mr. BEARD):

H. Res. 1078. Resolution requiring the administration of an oath to each Member of the House prior to the consideration of any resolution of impeachment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 14502. A bill for the relief of Eugene M. Osman, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 14503. A bill for the relief of Jesus Cruz-Figueroa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

442. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the Community Action Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

443. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, relative to the persecution of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

444. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to requiring the marking of the sides of railroad cars with light reflecting material; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

445. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to State regulation and preservation of natural resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

446. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the establishment of a national health care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

432. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to the designation of April 30 as "National Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

433. Also, petition of Gary Grant and other members of the Washington State Senate, relative to impeachment of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"NU-LIFE" FOR AMPUTEES AND PARALYZED PATIENTS

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, it is with no small amount of pride that I bring to my colleagues' attention a medical and scientific "breakthrough" which can ease the suffering of thousands of patients who are forced by accident or disease to depend either in whole or in part on the services of hospital personnel or others for even the simplest personal, daily activities.

The thought of lying in bed totally incapable of performing a function as simple as turning a dial to call a doctor or nurse, or helplessly awaiting the "rounds" for someone to dial a telephone number, is almost beyond the comprehension of the healthy. Nevertheless, there are many persons throughout the country who are afflicted to such an extent that their lives, literally, have become a series of minor movements. Without help from the healthy, such